











# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

## Monterey, California



# THESIS

ARE NAVY MEMBERS  
WITH INTEGRATED BEHAVIORAL STYLES  
CONSIDERED TO BE MORE EFFECTIVE?

by

Christine Marie McMahon

September 1984

Thesis Advisor:

E. Hamilton

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

T222973

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE  |                       | READ INSTRUCTIONS<br>BEFORE COMPLETING FORM                             |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER   | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER   |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle)<br>Are Navy Members with Integrated Behavioral Styles Considered to be More Effective?   |                       | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED<br>Master's Thesis<br>September 1984 |
|  |                       | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER  |
| 7. AUTHOR(s)<br>Christine Marie McMahon  |                       | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)  |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93943   |                       | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS             |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93943   |                       | 12. REPORT DATE<br>September 1984                                       |
|  |                       | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>140  |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)  |                       | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)                                    |
|  |                       | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE                              |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)<br>Approved for public release, distribution unlimited   |                       |   |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)   |                       |   |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  |                       |   |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>Influence behavior, Influence effectiveness, Influence, Effectiveness, Effective managers, Effective leaders, Agency, Communion, Japanese management, leader's behaviors, Individualism versus Groupism, Navy leaders, FIRO-B, Control behaviors   |                       |   |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>This study examines the relationship between influence behaviors and an individual's effectiveness in a work team. The influence behaviors of individuals in 17 Navy decision-making groups from both shore and operational commands are tested in order to determine which behaviors are valued and considered to be most predictive of perceived effectiveness and influence. In addition, individuals' preferences to control or to be controlled are compared with their influence behaviors and perceived effectiveness. The |                       |   |

results indicate that individuals who exhibit both behaviors that are aimed at asserting their own ideas or 'selves', defined as agentic behaviors, and behaviors that allow others to express their ideas or 'selves', defined as communal behaviors, are considered most effective by other group members at influencing group outcomes.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Are Navy Members  
with Integrated Behavioral Styles  
Considered to be More Effective?

by

Christine M. McMahon  
Lieutenant, United States Navy  
B.A., University of Delaware, 1977

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
September 1984

---



## ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between influence behaviors and an individual's effectiveness in a work team. The influence behaviors of individuals in 17 navy decision-making groups from both shore and operational commands are tested in order to determine which behaviors are valued and considered to be most predictive of perceived effectiveness and influence. In addition, individuals' preferences to control or to be controlled are compared with their influence behaviors and perceived effectiveness. The results indicate that individuals who exhibit both behaviors that are aimed at asserting their own ideas or 'selves', defined as agentic behaviors, and behaviors that allow others to express their ideas or 'selves', defined as communal behaviors, are considered most effective by other group members at influencing group outcomes.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 11 |
| II.  | THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK . . . . .   | 18 |
|      | A. OVERVIEW . . . . .   | 18 |
|      | B. WHY AGENCY AND COMMUNION? . . . . .  | 18 |
|      | C. JAPANESE/AMERICAN CULTURES LINKED TO<br>COMMUNION/AGENCY . . . . .           | 21 |
|      | 1. Japan's Roots . . . . .  | 21 |
|      | 2. America's Roots . . . . .  | 22 |
|      | D. COMMUNION/AGENCY IN JAPANESE AND AMERICAN<br>MANAGEMENT . . . . .            | 24 |
|      | 1. Empirical Studies . . . . .  | 25 |
|      | 2. A Comparison of Two Managers . . . . .                                       | 26 |
|      | 3. Similar Formulas for "Sustained"<br>Success . . . . .                        | 29 |
|      | E. WHY INTEGRATING ONE'S MANAGEMENT STYLE IS<br>DIFFICULT . . . . .             | 30 |
|      | 1. Negative Face of Power and Unmitigated<br>Agency . . . . .                   | 31 |
|      | F. THE POWER OF INTEGRATING AGENCY AND<br>COMMUNION . . . . .                   | 33 |
|      | G. THE BOTTOM LINE . . . . .  | 34 |
| III. | LITERATURE REVIEW . . . . .   | 37 |
|      | A. OVERVIEW . . . . .   | 37 |
|      | B. CONTROL NEEDS . . . . .  | 37 |
|      | C. SHARING CONTROL, ANOTHER INFLUENCE<br>STRATEGY . . . . .                     | 39 |
|      | D. INTEGRATING AGENCY/COMMUNION TO ACHIEVE<br>INFLUENCE EFFECTIVENESS . . . . . | 41 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| E.  | SUMMARY AND PREVIEW OF THESIS STUDY . . . . .           | 41 |
| IV. | METHCDOLOGY . . . . .                                   | 43 |
| A.  | OVERVIEW . . . . .                                      | 43 |
| B.  | SUBJECTS . . . . .                                      | 45 |
| 1.  | Overview of Commands in Sample . . . . .                | 45 |
| C.  | RECRUITMENT OF SUBJECTS . . . . .                       | 46 |
| D.  | MEASURES . . . . .                                      | 47 |
| 1.  | Influence Style Questionnaire . . . . .                 | 47 |
| 2.  | FIRO-B . . . . .  | 48 |
| E.  | PROCEDURE . . . . .                                     | 49 |
| F.  | DATA ANALYSIS . . . . .                                 | 50 |
| 1.  | Reliability Analyses . . . . .                          | 50 |
| 2.  | Hypotheses I and II . . . . .                           | 51 |
| 3.  | Hypotheses II and IV . . . . .                          | 52 |
| 4.  | Hypothesis V . . . . .                                  | 52 |
| 5.  | Hypothesis VI . . . . .                                 | 53 |
| V.  | FINDINGS . . . . .                                      | 54 |
| A.  | RELIABILITY RESULTS . . . . .                           | 54 |
| 1.  | Reliability Analysis using Cronbach<br>Alphas . . . . . | 54 |
| 2.  | Reliability of Self/Other Ratings . . . . .             | 54 |
| B.  | RESULTS IN RELATION TO THESIS HYPOTHESES . . . . .      | 56 |
| 1.  | Hypothesis I . . . . .                                  | 56 |
| 2.  | Hypothesis II . . . . .                                 | 57 |
| 3.  | Hypotheses III and IV . . . . .                         | 58 |
| 4.  | Hypothesis V . . . . .                                  | 60 |
| 5.  | Hypothesis VI . . . . .                                 | 61 |
| VI. | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .                    | 64 |
| A.  | SUMMARY OF STUDY AND ITS RESULTS . . . . .              | 64 |
| 1.  | Methodological Issues . . . . .                         | 66 |
| B.  | DISCUSSION . . . . .                                    | 72 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX A: QUESTIONS, SCALES, AND RELIABILITY    |     |
| STATISTICS . . . . .                              | 75  |
| APPENDIX B: ISQ . . . . .                         | 79  |
| APPENDIX C: ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL POWER . . . . .  | 85  |
| APPENDIX D: THE FIRC READER . . . . .             | 92  |
| A. THE DEFINITIONS OF THE INTERPERSONAL           |     |
| DIMENSIONS . . . . .                              | 92  |
| 1. Inclusion . . . . .                            | 92  |
| 2. Control . . . . .                              | 95  |
| 3. Openness . . . . .                             | 98  |
| B. INTERPRETATIONS OF SUMMARY SCORES . . . . .    | 102 |
| 1. Inclusion Types . . . . .                      | 103 |
| 2. Control Types . . . . .                        | 106 |
| 3. Openness Types . . . . .                       | 107 |
| C. SUMMARY . . . . .                              | 109 |
| APPENDIX E: PERSONAL & GROUP DATA SHEET . . . . . | 110 |
| APPENDIX F: TABLES . . . . .                      | 113 |
| APPENDIX G: MULTIPLE REGRESSION FIGURES . . . . . | 131 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES . . . . .                      | 134 |
| INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST . . . . .               | 138 |



## LIST OF TABLES

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 1.  | Overview of Age of Subjects . . . . .                                   | 116 |
| 2.  | Education Level . . . . .   | 116 |
| 3.  | Years Active Duty . . . . .   | 117 |
| 4.  | Years in Grade . . . . .  | 117 |
| 5.  | Title or Rank . . . . .   | 117 |
| 6.  | Total Years at Command . . . . .  | 118 |
| 7.  | Average Time as Groupmember . . . . .                                   | 118 |
| 8.  | Hours Group Met . . . . .   | 118 |
| 9.  | Self and Other Agency/Communion Score<br>Comparisons . . . . .          | 119 |
| 10. | Correlations between Control and AT,CT Scores .                         | 119 |
| 11. | Multiple Regressions (Own Scores Predicting<br>Others Scores) . . . . . | 120 |
| 12. | Multiple Regressions (Own Predicting Others<br>Scores) . . . . .        | 120 |
| 13. | Multiple Regressions (Own Scores Predicting<br>Others) . . . . .        | 121 |
| 14. | Multiple Regressions (Own Scores Predicting<br>Others) . . . . .        | 121 |
| 15. | Communion Totals between Raters . . . . .                               | 122 |
| 16. | Agency Totals between Raters . . . . .                                  | 122 |
| 17. | Inter-rater Comparisons of Knowledge Variable .                         | 123 |
| 18. | Inter-rater Comparisons on Satisfaction<br>Variable . . . . .           | 123 |
| 19. | Inter-rater Comparisons on Infl of Decisions .                          | 124 |
| 20. | Inter-rater Comparisons of Infl on Process . . .                        | 124 |
| 21. | Inter-rater Comparisons on Infl on<br>Effectiveness . . . . .           | 125 |

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 22. | Relation between Agency and Effectiveness<br>Variables . . . . .    | 125 |
| 23. | Relation between Communion and Effectiveness<br>Variables . . . . . | 126 |
| 24. | Agency/Communion Correlated with Dependent<br>Variables . . . . .   | 126 |
| 25. | Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others) . . .                     | 127 |
| 26. | Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others) . . .                     | 127 |
| 27. | Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others) . . .                     | 127 |
| 28. | Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others) . . .                     | 128 |
| 29. | Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency &<br>Ccmmunion) . . . . .    | 128 |
| 30. | Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency &<br>Ccmmunion) . . . . .    | 128 |
| 31. | Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency &<br>Ccmmunion) . . . . .    | 129 |
| 32. | Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency &<br>Ccmmunion) . . . . .    | 129 |
| 33. | Relationships between Control and<br>Agency, Communich . . . . .    | 129 |
| 34. | Relation between Agency and Express Control . .                     | 130 |
| 35. | Relation between Want Control and Communion . .                     | 130 |
| 36. | Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge . . . . .                     | 130 |
| 37. | Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge . . . . .                     | 131 |
| 38. | Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge . . . . .                     | 131 |
| 39. | Mulitiple Regressions Adding Knowledge . . . . .                    | 132 |
| 40. | Means on Effectiveness/Control Variables by<br>Catagory . . . . .   | 132 |
| 41. | Difference in Express Control within Sample . .                     | 133 |
| 42. | Differences on Want Control within Sample . . .                     | 133 |
| 43. | Differences on Control Scores between High/Low<br>Sample . . . . .  | 133 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|     |                                |     |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----|
| G.1 | Multiple Regressions . . . . . | 134 |
| G.2 | Multiple Regressions . . . . . | 135 |
| G.3 | Multiple Regressions . . . . . | 135 |
| G.4 | Multiple Regressions . . . . . | 136 |
| G.5 | Multiple Regressions . . . . . | 136 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the mid-1970's American management stood up and noticed their Japanese counterparts. The overwhelming success of the Japanese in the automobile industry and in computer technology became the impetus for a reexamination of what makes American management effective [Ref. 1]. While the Japanese 'mystique' has captured our interest, the basic issue of management effectiveness is not new.

Much empirical research has been directed, unsuccessfully, at developing a model of effective leadership [Ref. 2], [Ref. 3]. For several decades that research has focused on the "initiation of structure" and "consideration of persons" tradition [Ref. 4], [Ref. 5]. However, these research efforts have yielded few consistent results, because according to [Ref. 6], they have lacked a theoretical framework which adequately explained causal relationships or paid attention to intervening variables involved in the leader-subordinate relationship.

Given that the results of the "initiation of structure" and "consideration of persons" studies have been inconclusive, it is not surprising that American managers have been intrigued by the Japanese manager's success and continue to search for an answer to the effectiveness question. Yet, while the literature on Japanese management effectiveness has provided additional insights, it has done little in terms of clarifying a framework through which to consider effectiveness [Ref. 7].

The fact that effectiveness is still a 'mystery' confirms Yukl's assertion about the need to test leadership effectiveness using a theoretical framework that adequately explains both what directly causes leader-subordinate



behavior and what additional factors act as intervening variables. The testing of such a theoretical framework is the focus of this study.

After reviewing the recent literature on Japanese and American managerial effectiveness, the researcher has found a common theme throughout. This theme is best explained by the concepts of agency and communion, postulated by Bakan to be two fundamental determinants of human behavior. The concepts of agency and communion are the basis of the research conducted here. [Ref. 8]

Agency is a "goal-oriented" sense of self, exhibited by characteristics of self-assertion, self-expansion and self-protection (see Appendix A for an explanation of the specific question items and scales addressing each concept). Agentic behaviors are driven by an individual's desire to control his environment so that his goals can be achieved. The other determinant, communion, is characterized by selflessness and a need to create harmonious and nurturing relationships. Communal behaviors are founded in a willingness to subsume the self and to allow others to take control of outcomes in order to preserve relationships. The basic difference between the two is in agency's orientation toward the self and communion's orientation towards others. [Ref. 9]

The building of empires, conquest of territories, erection of skyscrapers and expansion of industrial giants like IBM and AT&T are the consequences of agency. The nurturing of future generations and the willingness to sacrifice personal desires to sustain and improve the well-being of society are the results of communion.

Bakan proposes that a high degree of either communion or agency, without the mitigating effect of the other, is destructive to both the individual and his/her community. Hitler's Third Reich during the 1940's is a classic example

of unmitigated agency. Hitler's Germany was an empire with an unswerving drive to expand, based on a desire to overcome the "weak" and create a society that would be a monument to the strongest and most gifted, his German people. An example of communion without agency is the all-giving idealist, a crusader of a "just " cause who is ridiculed and scourged by his/her community but continues to preach his/her message for the community's sake, e.g., Don Quixote who fought windmills and dragons in an effort to make right what was wrong until he finally died from overexertion. Since unmitigated agency or unmitigated communion result in destruction [Ref. 10], the challenge for each individual as they develop, mature and grow, and for society as a whole is to integrate both agency and communion.

This study is specifically designed to test whether the combination of agentic and communal behaviors in one's leadership style are helpful in explaining the degree to which others consider him to be effective in the group. Since leadership behaviors cover a wide range of activities, they have been specifically defined for the purposes of this research. One common definition of leadership is the ability to influence others [Ref. 5], so a leader's influence behaviors will be the focal point for measuring effectiveness in this study. Effectiveness as measured by this study has been defined in terms of influence on the group's process, influence on the group's decisions, influence on the group's effectiveness and satisfaction with one's behavior (see Appendix A for a detailed description of the various effectiveness scales). In order to examine the influence effectiveness of group members, the researcher administered two questionnaires to 120 U.S. Navy personnel from 17 different U.S. Navy decision-making groups, e.g., department heads, planning boards. These groups were from shore and operational commands.

The central prediction of the study is that individuals' agentic and communal behaviors, the independent variables, as measured by the reports of four other group members on the Influence Style Questionnaire, ISQ, (see Appendix B) [Ref. 11], will be positively related to their effectiveness in the group and that the combination of agency and communion will significantly explain the majority of variation around effectiveness, with individuals scoring high on both agency and communion having the highest effectiveness scores and most flexible (moderate) control scores.

There are several corollary hypotheses. The first two are that an individual's agentic behavior will depend upon the degree to which he wants to be in control (as measured by the express control scale on the fundamental interpersonal reader, FIRO-B, see Appendix C) and that an individual's communal behavior will depend upon the degree to which he prefers to be controlled (as measured on the want control scale of the FIRO-B). The second corollary hypothesis is that an individual's knowledge of decision issues is likely to increase his/her influence on the group's decisions [Ref. 6].

Support for these hypotheses would have significant implications for the navy leader. As navy members advance in seniority, more of their time is spent in meetings and decision-groups. Although the Navy is highly reliant on legitimate hierarchical authority, most decisions are seldom made without the influence of others in the Navy organization. Therefore, the study of influence is important to all members of U.S. Navy decision-making groups. Influence behavior in particular, is especially important to U.S. Navy leaders. In the traditional view, the superior has the legitimate right to command a subordinate and the subordinate must comply, but more contemporary views of authority have challenged this perspective. It has been generally

recognized that effective performance in a combat situation requires a leadership style based on discipline and teamwork. While the U.S. Navy (military organizations in general) is designed to impart discipline, insisting on obedience to the orders of superiors, the formal authority of the leader isn't enough to spark the spirit and initiative of followers, qualities that may be needed to achieve a military objective. Consequently, it is believed that military unit leadership involves a combination of formal and informal leadership techniques that will provide the sense of group identification needed to offset the fear of death in combat situations [Ref. 12]. "Certainly, an officer must first establish his credibility and gain the trust of his subordinates if he expects to inspire and lead them." [Ref. 13] And how is credibility and trust obtained? Staley suggests that a unique key to leading effectively is being able to be open to the "collective" wisdom of the staff (communion) and to realize that the ability to listen to the viewpoints of the opposition neither weakens a sound intuitive decision nor strengthens a poor one [Ref. 14]. His ideas, along with those of others found in the military leadership literature which advocate more decentralization of decisions, increasing teamwork and lengthening commanders' tours so they can be more "institutionally" versus "occupationally" oriented sound very similar to many of the concepts lauded as the keys to Japanese management success [Ref. 7].

In fact, the navy has initiated several studies aimed at examining some of the Japanese management 'arts' in an effort to assess their usefulness to the United States Navy [Ref. 15]. One 'Japanese' management technique which some navy organizations have implemented is the quality circle. A study conducted by the Naval Research and Development Center aimed at assessing the interest and involvement of



navy organizations in productivity improvement programs in general and quality circles (QCs) in particular, concluded that the interest in implementing QCs and the expectations for their success was high in the navy [Ref. 16]. Thus the military has joined American industry in its interest in the 'Japanese management mystique'.

But should the hypotheses proposed above be supported, it would suggest that Japanese management techniques may not be the answer for the navy leader. The results from the research conducted in conjunction with this researcher's thesis on effective leadership may suggest other ways for leaders to make a difference without solely relying on their positional power or the institutionalization of managerial techniques, such as quality circles, as the means of inspiring sailors to contribute and produce. This research may demonstrate that individuals who are capable of expanding their range of personal influence behaviors by incorporating both agency and communion into their behavioral styles are able to significantly strengthen their impact on the behaviors of others.

The remainder of this thesis not only includes the methodology and results of this empirical research, but also a summary of the relevant literature. Specifically, the following section explores the concepts of agency and communion in more detail and links these concepts with the issues that have surfaced in the literature on Japanese and American managerial effectiveness. In order to provide additional insight to the dynamics central to much of the controversy around management in Japan and America, and to exemplify the underlying differences between agency and communion, a section on power and control needs is also included.

Chapter three reviews the research that has been conducted on influence, control needs, and behaviors of

group members. In particular, studies in which the FIRO-B or ISQ questionnaires (the instruments employed in this particular thesis research) are discussed.

Chapter four summarizes the research conducted, provides an overview of the sample, discusses how the research data was obtained and analyzed. Chapter five discusses the major results found. In the last chapter, the study's purpose and findings are summarized, methodological issues and results are discussed, conclusions are made, and implications are suggested.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### A. OVERVIEW

Chapter two examines agency and communion in greater detail and draws from the recent literature on Japanese and American management effectiveness to exemplify Bakan's concepts. The purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with a better understanding of agency and communion and to argue that these concepts capture the essence of managerial effectiveness. In order to accomplish these goals examples of agency and communion found in American and Japanese management literature will be discussed and the concept of control will be explored to unveil some of the dynamics existing that make the integration of agency and communion difficult.

### B. WHY AGENCY AND COMMUNION?

Why has the researcher chosen agency and communion as the concepts to be empirically studied versus the "initiation of structure" and "consideration of persons" tradition? To examine this question let us first compare the definitions of the two models. "Initiation of structure" reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individuals who play a more active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, trying out new ideas, etc. "Consideration of persons" reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas and consideration of

their feelings. [Ref. 4] The dichotomy between the two is primarily one involving structuring a task and being concerned with the process (people's feelings) in order to accomplish that task.

In contrast, Bakan's agency is described as a "goal-oriented sense of self, manifested in such characteristics as self-assertion, self-expansion and self-protection while communion, reflects selflessness and the need to be one with others [Ref. 8]. Agency then is the tendency to be concerned with self, while communion is the tendency to submerge the self in order to be at one with others. While "initiating structure" is characterized by initiating one's own ideas in order to structure a task, it does not explicitly include the agentic characteristics of self-protection and self-expansion. Likewise, while "consideration of persons" is characterized by listening to subordinates' ideas and considering their feelings, it does not explicitly include a willingness to reveal one's own vulnerabilities or give up one's own ideas (subsume the self) for the good of the group. Thus, while "initiation of structure" and "consideration of persons" bear resemblances to agency and communion, the key distinction lies in the fact that agency is linked specifically with a desire to preserve and expand the self versus simply accomplishing a task and communion includes a willingness to reveal one's vulnerabilities at the expense of the self versus simply considering others' feelings. Since it is the basic distinction between self and other that is at the heart of the research on influence effectiveness conducted by the researcher, agency and communion will serve as the framework for this study.

Further, while experiments using the concepts of "initiating structure" and "considering persons" have yielded mixed results in terms of predicting effectiveness [Ref. 6], the fundamental concepts of agency and communion, based on a



self/other dichotomy have been strongly linked with influence effectiveness in a recent study conducted by Hamilton [Ref. 17]. The researcher's focus on Bakan's framework will provide another test to see if agency and communion are helpful in predicting influence effectiveness.

An additional reason for considering the self/other, agency/communion dichotomy results from the researcher's review of recent popular literature concerning what makes managers effective. A large portion of the literature in the last 10 to 12 years has involved Japanese management and has focused on comparing Japanese and American managerial styles [Ref. 7]. The researcher has found that a common comparison between the Japanese and American styles of management has concerned the Japanese tendency toward collectivism (others) [Ref. 18] which is similar to communion and the American tendency toward individualism (self) [Ref. 19] which is similar to agency. The fact that these comparisons have been made in terms of the self/other dichotomy and the fact that the integration of Japanese and American management techniques have been addressed in recent management literature [Ref. 1], lends further support for examining agentic and communal behaviors of managers and the impact of their integration on influence effectiveness.

An even stronger argument for considering the integration of agency and communion can be made if one reviews the research on Japanese and American sustained excellence conducted by two sets of researchers associated with the McKinsey Corporation, Athos and Pascale, and Peters and Waterman. Both sets of researchers have concluded that the most successful American and Japanese companies not only value individual achievement and performance (agency) but encourage workers to contribute ideas, work in teams and cooperate with each other (communion) [Ref. 1], [Ref. 22]. Thus the integration of agency and communion seem to offer a

seem to offer a means of explaining the formula for American as well as Japanese effectiveness.

### C. JAPANESE/AMERICAN CULTURES LINKED TO COMMUNION/AGENCY

The next section of this chapter provides examples of the difference in emphasis on communion versus agency that can be found when comparing the Japanese and Americans. In order to understand why the Japanese have been described as collectivist [Ref. 18] and the Americans individualists [Ref. 19], we must first look at the two countries and their historical origins.

#### 1. Japan's Roots

Japan has been a united nation since the third century A.D. and was ruled for twelve centuries by emperors and then for six more centuries by families of military dictators or shoguns. The society was fundamentally feudal so that individuals lived in groups (feudal systems) and were responsible to a common lord. Japan was virtually isolated from the rest of the world except for Portugal and Holland with whom she conducted limited trade until the 19th century. The isolated location of Japan and the fact that approximately 20% of the land was habitable meant that the Japanese people became accustomed to living in close proximity and learned to depend on each other to survive. Thus, Japan's geography and her feudal system of government contributed to the Japanese people's tendency toward collectivism. Even after the 1890's when Japan expanded its territories and became industrialized, the Japanese remained primarily a homogeneous people. Their limitations in terms of producing their own natural resources forced them to band together and to rely on each other to survive. [Ref. 23]

Having suffered defeat in World War II, Japan, with the help of the United States, underwent reconstruction and eventually became a strong competitor in the automobile and technological markets. Her success was primarily a result of striving to increase her resources, i.e., primarily her people. She did this by gaining as much knowledge from the outside world as possible and by developing her people's ability so she could lay claim to a substantial piece of world trade.

Thus Japan's geography and history have been determinants of her homogeneous complexion, and her limited resources have forced her people to live and work in greater harmony (ccmmunion). [Ref. 18]

## 2. America's Roots

The story of Japan contrasts the story of America's beginnings. America was founded by people looking for a place where they could develop and prosper based on their individual abilities, instead of being tied to a predetermined European life. Since America was a new frontier, agency or self-assertion, was a key element in her taming. The ingenuity and individual fortitude (self-assertion) of frontiersmen and pioneers enabled them to brave an unknown land, conquer it and mold out their own living. Because the majority of Americans gained their livelihood from the soil during the first 300 years of American history, agrarian principles like self-reliance, formed the foundation of American tradition and became incorporated into the Declaration of Independence, a number of state constitutions, the Bill of Rights and writings of men like Jefferson. The ideal was a self-contained, self-sufficient farm identified with a man and his family. The agrarian life required man to contend with nature rather than other men to survive. The early American had to assert himself,

be self-reliant, and independent of others (be agentic) if he was to have control over his own survival. [Ref. 24]

While modern America has substantially less farmers in proportion to people in other livelihoods, the individual is still an elemental part of our American fabric. We are taught at a young age to take care of ourselves and we live in a society in which even the dependence on the family group has been diminished as a result of our mobility. [Ref. 15]

In examining the myths concerning American and Japanese roots it becomes clear that Americans have been traditionally characterized as 'individualist' and the Japanese characterized as 'collectivist'. But the truth is that neither country's people have been as extreme in their orientations as their mythical characterizations have inferred. There was competition for power and wealth in Japan, especially between feudal lords [Ref. 25], just as there was collaboration in the U.S., where even in the rugged pioneer days neighbors gathered together to help each other out, e.g., barn raising on the frontiers. The point is that while competition has existed in Japan and collaboration in America, the characteristic myths about 'the American' versus 'the Japanese' people have emphasized the value of individualism versus collectivism to differing degrees.

Where the Japanese culture has developed a fundamental value of 'wa' or harmony (communion) [Ref. 18], partly due to the necessity of the Japanese people to band together for survival; the American tradition has been founded in individual achievement and self-reliance (agency) [Ref. 19]. These fundamental values, collectivism versus individualism, manifest themselves in the Japanese manager's emphasis on the group as opposed to the American manager's emphasis on individual achievement [Ref. 15]. These



differences in emphasis are best exemplified by exploring typical managerial practices of the Japanese and Americans.

#### D. COMMUNIC/AGENCY IN JAPANESE AND AMERICAN MANAGEMENT

In his book, Theory Z Ouchi argues that the essential differences between typically American and Japanese organizations lie in some key structural issues and cultural values which encourage certain management styles to flourish. Specifically, he points out that major Japanese companies employ their key people for life (or until forced retirement at age 55 or 60), rotate them through various functions, promote them slowly and according to more of a seniority than merit system, and place responsibility on groups like quality circles rather than on individuals [Ref. 15]. These observations are illustrative of a system that nurtures the development of its people and is primarily concerned with group versus individual achievement, i.e., is more communal.

Ouchi contrasts the "typical Japanese" organization with a typically American, bureaucratic model. He cites typical American practices including the retainment of employees only as long as they are contributing to the organization's growth and expansion, little concern for obtaining suggestions from workers, and immediate feedback based on individual performance and responsibility. Ouchi's typical American model is reflective of a results-oriented system that requires individuals to produce, judges them on individual performance and at the same time focuses on controlling organizational outcomes to ensure the achievement of organizational profits. All of these actions are more reflective of an organization that primarily values agency and is unwilling to allow workers to have too much control over the organization's fate. [Ref. 15]



## 1. Empirical Studies

Empirical studies of Japanese and American practices further support Ouchi's description of typically Japanese and American management systems and further illustrate a Japanese tendency towards communion as opposed to an American tendency toward agency. Most of the research that has been conducted in an effort to compare Japanese and American managers has focused on communication and decision-making processes [Ref. 7]. Abegglen found that the Japanese were very involved in the communication process [Ref. 26]. His findings were supported by Yoshino who reported that the Japanese were able to communicate quickly and easily up and down the organizational hierarchy and that they emphasized consultative decision-making [Ref. 27]. In another study during which open-ended interviews with workers from Japanese companies in the United States were conducted, Ouchi and Johnson also found that the Japanese emphasized the flow of information and initiative from the bottom of the organization up and stressed consensus in decision-making. They concluded that the inclusion of employees in these processes was one distinguishing factor of Japanese management [Ref. 28]. Pascale and MacGuire, who conducted an empirical study in which they analyzed survey and organizational data from 37 Japanese companies either located in America or Japan, also found that the Japanese relied more on consultative decision-making in which employees were allowed to participate in the decision-making process [Ref. 29].

All of these studies are consistent in that they distinguish American and Japanese managers in terms of the relative involvement of their workers in decision-making and organizational processes. Howard and Teramoto contend that this difference in worker participation in the

decision-making process results from the fact that the Japanese culture actually enables Japanese managers to more fully understand social processes, and in particular decision-making. To prove this point they contrast the Japanese and American words used to describe the decision-making process. They suggest that the process of decision-making as it is described in English overstresses the element of conflict or agency in terms of asserting one's own will. To support their reasoning they give examples of English words typically used in describing American decision-making, e.g., communication, conflict, confrontation, compromise, negotiation, and control; all terms that infer a game theoretic property. In comparison, the Japanese word for the process 'nemawashi', means the process of planting a tree and implanting its roots to allow it to grow, a definition that includes the concept of nurturance, i.e., communica. Howard and Teramoto argue that the Japanese definition perfectly describes the necessary processes of practical decision-making in any culture and thus contend that the Japanese culture, which the researcher has linked to a more communal orientation, enables the Japanese to have a better understanding of the dynamics of decision-making. [Ref. 30]

## 2. A Comparison of Two Managers

Up to this point, the theories about American/Japanese managerial differences, as well as empirical evidence, have been discussed. Let us now consider a more concrete comparison. In their recent book The Art of Japanese Management Athos and Pascale compare two prominent executives, one American (Geneen of ITT) and one Japanese (Matsuchito of Matsuchito) and provide numerous illustrations that support the researcher's contention that the Japanese make more use of communion, while the Americans

tend to concentrate on agency. Pascale and Athos preface their comparison by stating the two managers are examples of extremes, but they also state they are representative of the contrasts the authors encountered when they compared a number of Japanese and American managers and organizations. [Ref. 1]

In their description, Geneen is depicted as a forceful influence on ITT. Pascale and Athos describe the principle elements of Geneen's approach:

"Geneen, like General Patton, understood what it meant to wear two pistols," one ITT old-timer recounts. "When Geneen first took over this company, he needed to let people know he was the boss, that he was the man in charge. He did this by calling them up at odd hours, by asking someone about 'item 3' in his report, by demonstrating his total recall of facts and figures. In Europe he insisted that people at meetings address themselves by first names, even though the custom in Europe had always been to use last names. Phone calls in the middle of the night can really encourage people to do their homework- and the word gets around." [Ref. 31]

#### a. Differing Styles

Athos and Pascale go on to talk about Geneen's unique way of holding meetings, describing how he 'zoomed' in on those who were unprepared, focused on 'unshakeable' facts in making decisions (i.e., the first hand opinion of an expert, based on the latest information) and staged meetings somewhat like inquisitions, setting up microphones into which presenters were to speak, and being interrogatory or even adversarial. According to Athos and Pascale Geneen's style created tensions between line and staff organizations but was effective because it was based on a system of checks and balances that enabled Geneen to have ultimate control [Ref. 21]. Athos and Pascale observe that Geneen's style enabled him to imprint his personality on every aspect of his organization. From their descriptions of Geneen, it is clear that his style was primarily agentic and controlling.

And while the authors note that he was successful in achieving profits for ITT they also note that his style was problematic and suggest that ITT under Geneen was almost a universe unto itself, obsessed with itself, as opposed to acting as a servant of society [Ref. 21], one of the negative consequences of unmitigated agency as outlined by Bakan [Ref. 8].

Pascale and Athos description of Matsuchito clearly contrasts Geneen's facts oriented, get to the point, self-asserting, controlling approach (all characteristic of agency). Pascale and Athos describe Matsuchito as valuing initiative, encouraging healthy conflict (like that between husbands and wives) and being energetic (agentic), however, they also indicate that his style was driven by an underlying philosophy to develop employees' skills and their 'inner selves'. Matsuchito did this through extensive training and by viewing employee recommendations as instrumental to making improvements. He dealt with employees who erred by demoting them so that they could learn from their mistakes, a marked difference from Geneen's more ruthless approach, firing [Ref. 32].

After comparing Geneen and Matsuchito in terms of their managerial styles, skills, orientation toward their staffs, emphasis on control systems, strategies, organizational structure and overall goals, Pascale and Athos conclude that the difference between the two leaders is founded in the kinds of shared goals they activate in their organizations. While Geneen focused on self-expansion and bottom-line profits (agency), Matsuchito additionally, focused on obtaining results by creating an environment where workers felt part of the Matsuchito family and felt like they were of value to the organization, i.e. Matsuchito employed communion and agency). [Ref. 33]



Geneen's agentic managerial style is illustrative of what Bradford and Cohen have termed the American heroic style of managing. Where the manager perceives his role through the "lone ranger" metaphor, i.e., riding into town on a white horse and single handedly (asserting the self, i.e., using agency) saving the helpless townspeople. Matsuchito's more paternal, nurturing approach in which training and development of the "ordinary worker" is the key, is more reflective of Bradford's and Cohen's developer manager. The developer uses a style that tends to involve subordinates not only in the task but also gives them more responsibility in terms of ensuring a successful outcome. The primary contrast between the heroic manager, Geneen, and the developer, Matsuchito, is the extent to which they expect employees to share responsibilities for the accomplishment of the organization's goals (the extent to which they practice communal behaviors). [Ref. 34]

### 3. Similar Formulas for "Sustained" Success

Yet researchers of American corporate excellence have found that those organizations like Hewlett-Packard and IBM that have been effective and profitable over long periods of time emphasize shared goals similar to those found in Japanese corporations that have had enduring success. For example, IBM encourages employees to contribute ideas and participate in decision-making while it encourages innovation and and competition [Ref. 35].

In Peters' and Waterman's most successful American organizations, workers have a sense of worth and meaning (they are nurtured and able to exert influence) and at the same time are encouraged to be ingenuous and self-asserting (agentic). In these excellent organizations, where orientations are integrated, the organization achieves production goals and profits and workers feel like they are able to



contribute to organizational outcomes. Thus, the whole organization wins, and is able to maintain excellence even when the chief executive steps down, because the people within the firm have been enkindled with a sense of meaning that goes beyond "getting just a satisfactory job done". [Ref. 35]

#### E. WHY INTEGRATING ONE'S MANAGEMENT STYLE IS DIFFICULT

But if the most effective American companies exhibit both agentic and communal orientations, as do most Japanese corporations, then why is it that more American corporations have not adapted these styles accordingly? A brief consideration of the definition of agency and communion in terms of their implications for maintaining control offers some insight into this query.

Agency is driven by the desire to 'impress' one's self on others and one's environment. In order to do this an individual attempts to assert his own opinions and/or desires (will) on others, is unwilling to allow others to sway him from his course (i.e., is self-protective) and aims at obtaining as much self-reliance and control over the outcome of his goals as possible. Such an orientation is reflective of a belief that maintaining control over one's own destiny means not allowing others to have any control over you [Ref. 36]. This basic belief about control is exemplified by those who believe control or power is a limited commodity. Therefore, managers subscribing to this view must amass control by aligning themselves with key people in the organization, being clear about designating turf and choosing only those subordinates who do not threaten their (own) control, i.e., exhibiting exclusively self-protecting behaviors (agency).

Believing the amount of power available is fixed, means that some will have more than others so that an individual must fight to control and gain as much power as possible. If one carries such a belief about power, he must be protective and unwilling to subsume his own will to others in order to 'win' [Ref. 37].

#### 1. Negative Face of Power and Unmitigated Agency

McClelland describes the win-lose orientation to power as the 'negative face of power' because it leads to simple or direct means of obtaining power, i.e., through control (agency). The consequences of focusing on the 'negative face of power' are that one seeks to amass control and resorts to self-protection to maintain power. But, according to McClelland, a sole concern with controlling to attain what one wants is ineffective because individuals who amass control treat others like pawns, take advantage of their positions and weaken others at the expense of building up themselves [Ref. 38]. Such actions are only destructive to the organization as a whole and bear a strong resemblance to what Bakan warns to be the consequences of extreme agentic behavior devoid of communion. According to Bakan, unmitigated agency results in ultimate destruction, because the organism becomes so concerned with its own survival that it destroys anything that limits or threatens its ability to exist and expand its territory. Like a malignant cancer, unmitigated agency drives an organism to devour others in order to thrive. When an individual is extremely agentic his primary desire is to increase his own control over his environment and to ensure that 'his' personal goals are obtained. In order to ensure 'his' mark on the world the individual characterized by unmitigated agency is not above sublimating others (i.e., not recognizing others' needs to assert their 'selves') for his own sake. [Ref. 8]

Thus, the manager who displays unmitigated agency puts his 'self' above others to such a degree that those others find they must be willing to almost completely subsume their own wills (selves) if they are to be able to cope with such an egocentric style. In the situation described, agency and communion are exhibited in extremes. Both behaviors are not balanced and incorporated into the behavioral styles of each individual organization member. [Ref. 8]

While one can imagine that the outcome of extreme control or agency in a management scenario might be the manager's achievement of success, the theories about unmitigated agency or extreme control suggest that success will be tenuous because it will be dependent on the ability of a manager to maintain control at every moment instead of inspiring followship through trust and participation [Ref. 39].

Ekan challenges mankind to integrate agentic and communal behaviors if it wishes to be effective. His conviction is that the integration of the two determinants, i.e., the ability to integrate the desire to assert one's self while recognizing that others have the same needs, is the key to a balanced existence [Ref. 8]. His contention is also reflected in McClelland's 'positive face of power'. The 'positive face of power' is founded on the idea that the power-pie is large enough for everyone to share. It is based on the belief that individuals can maintain control, not by amassing it, but by recognizing others' needs to control as well [Ref. 38]. In fact, by making others feel powerful, known as empowering, an individual's own sense of control and power can increase and the organization can thrive. [Ref. 39].

## F. THE POWER OF INTEGRATING AGENCY AND COMMUNION

When we compare the ideas involved in sharing control with the integration of agency and communion, we begin to gain insight into the power of an integrated agentic/communal behavioral strategy. By allowing others to voice their views and have impact on a group's decision (acting communally), one enables other group members to feel a sense of control over the outcome of their organization. In addition, the ability to argue strongly for one's own point of view (agency), and yet be open to the influence of others (communion), enables ideas to be explored more fully and alternatives to be considered. The outcome of such an exchange may not only produce a more comprehensive, thoughtful decision but may also result in gaining the commitment of the rest of the group to the decision and its implementation. [Ref. 34]

The manager who can integrate agency and communion becomes a powersharer, one who has control and also shares it. He is willing to recognize others, be open to influence (be communal) and allow others to have the potential for impact. At the same time, however, the powersharer, just by such actions gain further commitment and trust, actually increasing his/her ability to influence [Ref. 39]. Perhaps by sharing power and gaining commitment, one is being self-expanding or agentic, in the true sense. Thus, it becomes clear that the ability to control and allow others to control is at the heart of integrating agency and communion, which the researcher contends leads to sustained effectiveness.

At this point let us summarize the major points made in this chapter. First, it is important to keep in mind that the research conducted concerns effectiveness, a subject that has been of interest to managers for a long time



[Ref. 6]. We began by exploring the Japanese 'mystique', a popular subject in contemporary management literature, in order to understand managerial effectiveness more clearly. This chapter explored a commonly held belief that the Japanese value of groups versus the American value of individualism is at the core of the Japanese businessman's success. Common Japanese and American management practices and processes were then considered in an effort to shed light on the Japanese 'mystique'. These common practices were then linked to Bakan's concepts of agency and communion. Research on sustained American corporate excellence was cited in order to reveal that those American and Japanese companies that continue to be effective and profitable are similar in that they emphasize both agentic and communal values. The question of why agency and communion have been difficult to integrate has been explored by considering the implications involved in combining agentic and communal behaviors in terms of control and power. Finally, theoretical evidence, based on the concept of sharing power, has been provided to support the argument that an integration of Bakan's two behavioral determinants leads to more effective organizational outcomes.

#### G. THE BOTTOM LINE

Although there is evidence that the American companies that have experienced sustained excellence enable subordinates to share in the control of organizational tasks, there are many American corporations that have not embraced the idea of powersharing. Bradford and Cohen have noted that the idea of allowing others to control and have influence on organizational processes may not be easy for the American manager given his frontier myths and individualistic beginnings, but they stress that such an adjustment must be made



if America is to remain a strong industrial nation and achieve not mediocrity but excellence. The lesson to be learned is not that the 'American' bottom line, its tendency toward outspokenness, and drive for independence (agency) be foregone, nor that the 'Japanese' tendency toward collectivism and concern for harmony be embraced; but it is that an integration of both, agency and communion, has the potential for excellence.

There is considerable empirical evidence that the ability to allow others to share the control of tasks and organizational outcomes, instead of relying exclusively on one's ability to exert authority or control, increases worker commitment and productivity. In particular, behavioral strategies that encourage worker participation have been proven successful in achieving greater productivity and quality when groups of people are involved in accomplishing a task. [Ref. 40]

In the next chapter the research evidence linking increased productivity and managerial effectiveness with one's ability to allow others to share in the control of organizational outcomes is presented. The research reviewed specifically focuses on control and influence behaviors of individuals in groups. The area of review has been limited to influence behaviors in groups because the ability to influence others is central if one is to manage or lead effectively [Ref. 5]. In addition, the results of the influence studies reviewed substantially support those who have asserted that managers' abilities to achieve 'excellent' results including increased productivity, are reliant upon their abilities to use flexible behavior strategies that do not exclusively depend on exerting authority or exhibiting unilateral control [Ref. 39]. Research that has been conducted using the Fundamental Interpersonal Reader Orientation (FIRO-B) [Ref. 41], and the Influence Style

Questionnaire [Ref. 17], the two instruments used in this study to measure control preferences and the relationship between agency and communion to influence effectiveness, respectively, will be reviewed, as well.

### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### A. OVERVIEW

This chapter reviews the research that has been conducted on individual interpersonal needs and individual influence effectiveness in groups. Specifically, the research that has been done using the Fundamental Interpersonal Orientation Reader (FIRO-B) and the Influence Style Questionnaire (ISQ), the instruments which are used in this thesis research, are discussed.

The previous chapter has suggested that the integration of agency and communion is dependent on an ability to balance one's own need to control others with others' needs to have control. Further, it has been proposed that a manager's willingness to integrate agentic and communal behaviors is linked to his ideas about control. In addition to the rhetoric, is there evidence that managers should recognize and accede to others' needs for control because it is organizationally beneficial? The answer to this question is the focal point of this literature review.

#### E. CONTROL NEEDS

The empirical studies conducted in conjunction with Schutz's theory of leadership suggest that a concern for individual needs, one being the need to control, is important to the organization. Schutz proposes that leaders of groups must be aware that each individual member has three basic needs: control, affection and inclusion. His theory states that leaders must ensure that each group member's basic interpersonal needs are met and balanced within the work group, if the group is to be maximally effective in

accomplishing its task [Ref. 41]. To test his theory, Schutz developed the FIRO-B questionnaire. Most of his work with the FIRO-B has concentrated on assessing the interpersonal needs of individuals in groups to determine whether members' needs were compatible; i.e., either all group members had the same express and/or want needs for control, affection and inclusion or member's want and express needs complemented each other. In the case of control needs, a compatible group would be one whose members either had similar want and/or express control needs, as measured by the FIRO-B or whose members' needs were balanced, i.e., some members wanted to be controlled and some wanted to control. Schutz found that groups with members who all had similar needs, particularly groups whose members all had similar express control needs, were able to categorize their group in terms of its members' overall preferences to control [Ref. 41]. This finding provides evidence that at least "expressed" control needs produce specific behaviors that can be recognized and identified by others and thus lends support to the researcher's suggestion that ideas and preferences about control underlie individual behaviors.

Not only has Schutz's FIRO-B been successful in predicting certain individual behaviors, but it has also been predictive of certain outcomes of interpersonal interactions. Mos and Speisman found that using measures of interpersonal compatibility derived from scores on Schutz's FIRO-B, they were able to predict productivity in small groups [Ref. 42]. In addition, FIRO-B scores have seemed to be relevant variables in predicting patient-therapist interactions in psychotherapy [Ref. 43]. Thus, the FIRO-B scores have provided evidence about how individuals would relate on an interpersonal level based on their individual interpersonal needs. In addition, there has been evidence that individuals' needs for control, in particular, are related



to social power and trust [Ref. 44]. In a study that used Schutz's FIRO-B in addition to other instruments, researchers found that there were three power variables that accounted for most of the variance in trust. These were influence as rated by others which accounted for 23% of the variance in trust, the internal locus of control which accounted for 11% of the variance in trust and being low on expressed control (as measured by the expressed-control FIRO-B scale) which accounted for 6% of the total variance in trust. Schutz's and the Forst et al work indicate that the interpersonal need for control has some impact on group effectiveness and the level of group trust and these findings support those who advocate that sharing power with others and giving others control, empowering, leads to greater trust and group commitment [Ref. 39].

#### C. SHARING CONTROL, ANOTHER INFLUENCE STRATEGY

Additional empirical research on influence supports the hypothesis that sharing power builds trust and commitment. A recent study on managers' influence behaviors substantially supports the relationship between the ability to share control or power with one's effectiveness [Ref. 45].

In 1977, the Forum corporation, a research firm in New England, conducted some initial research in the area of influence behavior in order to define the practices that differentiated excellent influencers from moderate influencers. Research information was gathered by interviewing, surveying and analyzing questionnaires of influencers in seven Fortune 500 companies. As a result of this initial research, 24 influence practices were identified. Using this data Forum designed a training seminar which included feedback to participants on each of the 24 practices, confidentially rated by peers and associates. From 1977 to



1981 four thousand participants enrolled in the training program and Forum amassed a data base of 24,000 responses from colleagues, peers and associates. In a second phase of research, this data base was analyzed to determine underlying influence patterns. In addition the 24 practices were validated and configured into a model of influence which identified 56 tactics as components of successful influence. The model developed as a result of the research included three core practices or beliefs:

1. Being supportive and helpful to others
2. Being willing to share power for an overall goal
3. Behaving in a way that leads others to trust you.

(These strategies pertain particularly to managers who do not have positional control, i.e., peers in a decision-making forum. The three strategies strongly resemble those aspects of communal behavior in which 'others' views are sought and where an individual is willing to be influenced as a result.)

As a result of the Forum research, the researchers concluded that effective influencers are seen as collaborators and consensus builders.

"The values fundamental to influence are quite different from those of authoritarian management. The influencer believes that being supportive and helpful is a way to facilitate work. When that concept operates in the work environment, individuals will probably want to function as a team; individual goals give way to team goals; roles and responsibilities are defined; and mutually discussed. Instead of excluding people, the influencer takes care to include those who have a stake in a problem or project, recognizing the value of bringing together people with different opinions."

[Ref. 45]

#### D. INTEGRATING AGENCY/COMMUNION TO ACHIEVE INFLUENCE EFFECTIVENESS

Another study designed to empirically test Argyris' Model II theory of effective behavior, a behavioral strategy for creating a better world [Ref. 17], also examines the relationship between influence behaviors and an individual's effectiveness in a work team. Hamilton tested the influence behaviors of individuals in 17 work groups in a variety of organizations in order to determine which behaviors were valued and considered to be most predictive of perceived effectiveness and influence. She grouped the influence behaviors measured into two dimensions, agentic and communal behaviors. In her study, agentic behaviors were characterized by self-assertion, self-protection, and self-expansion. While communal behaviors were characterized by selflessness and a concern for others. Agentic behaviors included "recommending ways for the group to work", "proposing a schedule for the work to be done", "participating actively", and "arguing strongly for one's own point of view". Communal behaviors included "being sensitive to others", "facilitating others' participation", "showing interest in others' ideas" and "trying to keep communication lines open". As a result of her research, Hamilton found that an individual's influence effectiveness was highest when his behavior was composed of both agency and communion. Her research indicated that agentic behavior had the strongest correlation with "influence on the group's process" and "overall work effectiveness". [Ref. 17]

#### E. SUMMARY AND PREVIEW OF THESIS STUDY

The literature reviewed concerning control and influence suggests that the integration of self-oriented behaviors, agency, and other-oriented behaviors, communion, produces

the most effective influence strategy, especially when one cannot or does not want to rely only on positional power. The research study that is reported in the next chapter is aimed at further testing Hamilton's findings concerning the use of both agency and communion. Not only are the agentic and communal behaviors of individuals measured in an effort to assess their impact on an individual's influence effectiveness, but the degree to which an individual combines agency and communion is used to measure his relative effectiveness. In addition, individuals' needs to control and to be controlled are related to the agentic and communal behaviors they exhibit.

#### IV. METHODOLOGY

##### A. OVERVIEW

This chapter presents the research study that was conducted to test whether: (1) agency and communion were related to perceptions that individuals held about control and (2) whether agency and communion individually and then combined, were able to predict how individuals were viewed in terms of their effectiveness in a decision-making group.

The research was conducted by administering two questionnaires, the Fundamental Interpersonal Reader Orientation (FIRO-B) [Ref. 41], and the Influence Style Questionnaire (ISQ) [Ref. 11], to 120 U.S. Navy personnel who were members of 17 U.S. Navy decision-making groups. These groups included department lead groups, work center groups, planning boards and command committees, e.g., for recreation or safety. Questionnaires were administered by the researcher herself at scheduled group meetings, after obtaining the approval of the respective commanding officers and speaking with at least one of the group members, usually the leader, to check if the group actually engaged in decision-making. Face to face questionnaire administration was used in order to ensure members understood that participation was voluntary. In addition, the scheduled meetings enabled participants to have time set aside to complete the instruments and ask questions, the intention being to create an atmosphere where participants would provide the most valid information [Ref. 47].

Five ISQs were administered to each group member, one to be completed on themselves and four to be completed on four other group members, whose names had been randomly assigned



by the researcher beforehand. After completing the ISQ, individuals received two sets of scores on agency, communion, knowledge, influence on effectiveness, influence on process, influence on decision-making and satisfaction with one's behavior. One set of scores was obtained from the average of four other raters' assessments and the other a self-score. Each group member also completed the FIRO-B questionnaire on interpersonal needs and as a result, received a self-score on express and want control.

The ISQ and FIRO-B were administered to test the following hypotheses:

(1) Individuals' agentic and communal behaviors, the independent variables, as measured by the reports of four other group members on the influence style questionnaire (ISQ, see Appendix E), will be positively related to their effectiveness in the group.

(2) The combination of individuals' agentic and communal behaviors [Ref. 17], will be positively related to their effectiveness in the group and will significantly explain the majority of the variation of effectiveness scores.

(3) Individuals' agentic behaviors will depend upon the degree to which they want to be in control (as measured by the express control scale on the fundamental interpersonal reader, FIRO-B, see Appendix C).

(4) Individuals' communal behaviors will be related to and dependent upon the degree to which they prefer to be controlled (as measured on the want control scale of the FIRO-B).

(5) Individuals' knowledge of decision issues is likely to increase their influence on the group's decisions [Ref. 6].

(6) The relative degree of agency and communion an individual displays will impact on the degree of effectiveness ascribed to him and the similarity of an individuals' scores on express and want control, i.e., an individual high on agency and communion will have control scores that are moderate and will not differ significantly (see Appendix D).

## E. SUBJECTS

Data was collected from 17 "real" Navy decision-making groups with 5-18 members per group. The groups were primarily of three types: planning boards, work groups and department head groups. The total number of subjects was 120, with 110 males, 10 females; 70 officers, 43 enlisted and 7 civilian government employees.

### 1. Overview of Commands in Sample

The commands and communities represented by these groups were as follows:

#### Operational:

Two navy ships with over 200+ manning

Four air squadrons

#### Shore:

One personnel detachment

One training group

Three groups from a communications command

One group from a security command

One group from a medical command

Two assistance oriented commands

One legal command

One naval air station

The average age of subjects was 37 years with a range of 22 to 62. All individuals sampled had either finished high school or received a high school equivalency diploma (64.1%), 11% had associates degrees, 18.8% had bachelors degrees, 4.3% had masters or professional degrees and 1 individual (.9%) had a doctoral degree. The average time in service was 15.3 years and the average years in grade were 3.5 years. The sample included enlisted members from E1 to E9 and officers from O1 to O6. More than half of the sample were from the middle officer and enlisted grades (31.8% were either LT, LCDR, CW03, or CW04 and 21.8% were enlisted from petty officer first class to chief). The average number of years that subjects had been at the command was 1.6. The average number of years that subjects had been group members was 1.1. The average number of hours that group members had met with each other in total was 56.2. Table 1 through table 8 in Appendix F give the distributions of the study sample.

### C. RECRUITMENT OF SUBJECTS

Recruitment of subjects was accomplished primarily through the contact of the Organizational Effectiveness Center, Alameda and on a few occasions through contacting a colleague or friend. The researcher approached commanding officers of organizations with prospective groups, in order to obtain permission to have groups from their commands participate in her research. Once commanding officers' permission was obtained and it was determined that the command had groups fitting the criteria for the study, the researcher contacted a member of the group, usually the group leader. This was done either by making a personal

visit or through a phone conversation during which the researcher's requirements were discussed and any questions answered. Individuals contacted were asked to ascertain whether groups were willing to participate, voluntarily. The researcher followed this initial discussion with another phone call or visit to arrange for a date to meet with the group and administer the study. Prior to actually conducting the study, the researcher explained its purpose to all members and encouraged members to raise questions and/or concerns. The researcher was very careful to assure members that the research data would remain confidential and encouraged them all to voice any objections if they did not want to participate.

In return for their participation, group members were promised an individual, confidential report of their personal profile on these instruments, a picture of overall pattern of their group on the variables being studied, and an explanation of the underlying questions, the theory, and the results of the study.

All members of each group were asked to participate, with the exception of those members who were very new to the group and could not as yet know the others' influence style.

#### D. MEASURES

##### 1. Influence Style Questionnaire

This instrument (see Appendix B) was developed and pilot tested by Hamilton for use in her research on influence effectiveness in which 17 'real' groups from civilian organizations were sampled. Since her study had resulted in a high question item reliability, (with Cronbach Alphas



ranging from .89 to .96) and a high degree of correspondence between the independent and dependent variables (with agency and communion being significant at  $p=.05$  in predicting effectiveness and satisfaction), [Ref. 17] the researcher did not conduct a rigorous pilot study. Instead, ten navy students were asked to take the questionnaire, assessing one other member of a previous work group, in order to check the clarity of questions and questionnaire format. As a result of this preliminary study (no statistical analysis was conducted), the researcher made slight moderations to the wording on the Personal Data Sheet to fit the navy versus civilian sample (see Appendix E). The researcher did not modify either the ISQ or the FIRO-B.

The ISQ is composed of 38 items which ask a member of a decision-making group to describe and evaluate the behavior of another member of the group on a Likert scale of one to seven. There are three ISQ scales that measure agentic behavior. These are scales for self-assertion, self-expansion and self-protection. Three ISQ scales measure communal behavior in terms of selfless behaviors. One ISQ scale measures "knowledge of decision issues"; one measures the degree of "influence on the group's decision"; one, the degree of positive "influence on the group's process" and one measures the degree of positive "influence on the group's effectiveness". (See Appendix A for a complete breakdown of the ISQ questions and their corresponding scales.) This study, in contrast to Hamilton's, also had members complete an ISQ on themselves.

## 2. FIRO-B

This instrument (see Appendices C and D) is a 58 item self-report questionnaire with questions that ask individuals to indicate their preferences when interacting with others. The questionnaire was developed by Schutz and is

based on his theory of interpersonal behavior, in which three basic human needs are proposed and categorized depending on whether they are expressed or wanted.

Schutz's three basic types of interpersonal needs are: inclusion, control and affection. The first need, inclusion is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people in terms of interaction and association. This is broken down into expressed and wanted inclusion needs. The second need, control is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to influence and power. Control refers to the decision-making process between people. The third need, affection or openness, is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with others in terms of love and affection. (For a more detailed description of these needs and their meanings refer to Appendix D.) Since the FIRC-B has been used in other studies, it was not pilot-tested prior to conducting actual research [Ref. 41], [Ref. 48].

#### E. PROCEDURE

At a scheduled group meeting, group members were asked to complete the self-report FIRC-B and five influence Style Questionnaires, one on each of four other group members and one on themselves. (Assignment of ratings was done randomly by the researcher prior to the administration of the questionnaire.) Participants were again informed that this was a study on influence and voluntary participation and confidentiality were stressed. The researcher did not elaborate on the theory underlying the research, in order to avoid having subjects try to help out by answering questions in such a way as to prove the theory true. The researcher stated that her concern was that she get valid information.

She acknowledged that she was not going to give the group members detailed information about the study and apologized for the need to speak in generalities; however, she stated that an explanation of the theory and overall results of the study would be sent to participants when they were sent their personal results.

## F. DATA ANALYSIS

### 1. Reliability Analyses

#### a. Questionnaire Items

Cronbach Alpha reliability tests were performed to determine whether an individual's ISQ self-scores and his scores based on the ratings of other group members would be predictive should the ISQ questionnaire be readministered to the same population at a later date. Cronbach Alphas were calculated for each of the 11 questionnaire scales as well as on the sum of the three agency scales and the sum of the three communion scales. Since the totals of the agency scale and the totals of the communion scales were very high, regardless of whether the ISQ was completed by the individual himself or by others, agency totals and communion totals were used in the remaining analyses conducted. (see Appendix A for a description of the ISQ scales and their Cronbach Alpha statistics) As previously stated, since the FIRO-B had been used in other empirical studies already [Ref. 41], [Ref. 48], [Ref. 44], a reliability test on the FIRO-E question items was not performed.

#### b. Self versus other scores on the ISQ

In order to determine whether to use an individual's self-scores or the scores given by other group members in the data analysis, Pearson correlations were calculated.

First the agency totals obtained from individuals' self assessment were correlated with the agency totals obtained from others' ratings. The same analyses were then conducted using the 'self' and 'other' communion totals. Next agency totals and communion totals obtained from self-scores were correlated with express and want control scores (both of which were obtained from self-ratings), followed by a similar correlation analysis in which express and want control scores were compared with the agency and communion totals obtained from others' ratings. Then a multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to see whether an individual's own scores on the independent variables (knowledge, agency and communion) and the dependent variables (effectiveness and satisfaction) would predict the scores he/she received on these variables from other group members. Finally, in order to see whether the scores assigned an individual by other group members were consistent, a series of inter-rater correlations were conducted comparing how an individual was scored by one rater with the scores of the other raters who scored the same individual on agency, communion, knowledge and the effectiveness and satisfaction variables.

## 2. Hypotheses I and II

To test whether agency and communion were individually related to effectiveness, Pearson correlations, relating each determinant to the various effectiveness and satisfaction variables were calculated. After performing these simple correlations, a variable representing the combination of agency and communion totals was correlated with the effectiveness and satisfaction variables, to see if the combination of agency and communion was more strongly related to the dependent variables than either determinant by itself.



Agency and communion were then used in a stepwise multiple regression in order to see to what extent each of the two independent variables explained "influence on process", "influence on decisions", "influence on group effectiveness" and "others' satisfaction". Finally, a variable representing the combination of agency and communion was subjected to a similar multiple regression analyses to determine if the combination of agency and communion was a better predictor of effectiveness than either determinant individually. (Figure G.1 to Figure G.5 indicate all of the multiple regressions performed for this study.)

### 3. Hypotheses II and IV

To determine whether subjects' agentic behavior was related to their preferences to exert control and whether their communal behavior was related to their preferences to be controlled, agency was correlated with express-control scores from the FIRO-B and communion was correlated with want-control scores from the FIRO-B, respectively. Then to determine whether individual preferences concerning control were predictive of agentic or communal behavior, express-control was entered into a multiple regression equation to predict agency behaviors and want-control scores were used to predict communal behavior.

### 4. Hypothesis V

Hypothesis five predicted that an individual's knowledge of decision issues would most likely increase his/her influence on the group's decisions. To test this hypothesis, knowledge was included in another multiple regression equation along with agency and communion, to see if its addition further explained any variation in the dependent variable, "influence on group decisions".

## 5. Hypothesis VI

To see whether the relative degrees of agentic and communal behaviors displayed, impacted on the extent to which subjects were considered influential, the sample population was first broken up into four groups. These groups were based on individuals' combined agency and communion totals and included a group with high agency scores but low communion scores, a group with low agency scores but high communion scores, a group with high scores on both and a group with low scores on both. (High here means above the population mean score on agency and communion and low means below the population mean score.) Mean influence effectiveness and control scores were calculated for each of the four groups. Then the differences in the mean effectiveness scores of the extreme groups, the high/high group and the low/low group were compared (using a one-sided T test) to determine whether they were significantly different based on individuals' relative agency and communion integration scores.

To see whether differences between express-control and want-control scores were minimal (or insignificant) for individuals high on both agency and communion, the differences between these scores were subjected to a one-sided T test as well.

## V. FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings of the research study conducted. The results are presented for the reliability analyses, first and then for the specific hypotheses tested.

### A. RELIABILITY RESULTS

#### 1. Reliability Analysis using Cronbach Alphas

Appendix A gives the Cronbach Alphas for the ISQ question items and the 11 ISQ scales. It was found that question items and scales were highly reliable, when the question items were completed by several raters of one individual and less reliable when completed by the individual himself, .i.e., one could be highly assured that if other group members were given the questionnaire again, their responses would be consistent, but less sure of obtaining similar results if individuals were asked to complete the ISQ on themselves at a later date. Reliability coefficients ranged from .85 to .98 for items when answered by other group members and from .46 to .89 for items when answered by individuals themselves.

#### 2. Reliability of Self/Other Ratings

The results of the Pearson correlations which compared an individual's self-scores on agency and communion with the agency and communion scores he received from others are reported in table 9 in Appendix F. It was found that self-scores on agency totals had a weak but significant linear correlation ( $r=.29$ ,  $p=.002$ ) to agency totals calculated using the ratings of others. Communion self and other scores were not at all related ( $r=.01$ ,  $p=.45$ ).

The correlations of agency and communion scores (calculated from self and other ratings) with express and want control scores are reported in table 10 in Appendix F. Express-control was weakly but significantly correlated to agentic behavior as scored by others ( $r=.27$ ,  $p=.005$ ) and as scored by individuals themselves ( $r=.21$ ,  $p=.014$ ). However, expressed-control was not significantly related to communion, whether scored by the individuals themselves or by others. In addition, want-control scores were not related to agency totals, scored by either self or others and were also not related to an individual's own communion scores. Nevertheless, want-control scores were weakly yet significantly related to how others scored an individual on communion ( $r=.27$ ,  $p=.005$ ). These results, indicate that the self-scores, particularly on communion, differed from others' scores on this determinant.

Table 11 to table 14 in Appendix F report the multiple regression results when using self-scores to predict how others would score an individual. In general, individuals' own scores on the independent variables (agency, communion and knowledge) and on the dependent variables (satisfaction with individual's behavior and influence on group effectiveness, process and decisions) were not helpful in predicting how other group members would score them on the same independent and dependent variables. Only self-scores on "influence on decisions" were significant in predicting others' scores on "group decisions" (Beta .40,  $B=.36$ ,  $p=.010$ ) and on "influence on process" (Beta .41,  $B=.42$ ,  $p=.002$ ).

Since self and other scores on the independent and dependent variables were inconsistent, the scores assigned to an individual by other group members were compared to see if they were positively related to each other and might be a better indicator of observed behaviors than the self-scores.



The relationships between raters scores for a particular individual on the independent and dependent variables are reported in tables 15 through table 21 in Appendix F. Across all raters all of the independent variables were significantly and positively correlated, with correlations ranging from a low of ( $r = .25$ ,  $p = .006$ ) to a high of ( $r = .63$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The largest difference between raters scores was .26, on the dependent variable "influence on decisions".

Since self and other scores were generally unrelated, self-scores were not predictive of other's scores, and inter-rater scores were all positively related, the remainder of the analyses and results reported concerning the ISQ are based on an individual's scores as rated by other group members.

## B. RESULTS IN RELATION TO THESIS HYPOTHESES

### 1. Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I predicted that individuals' agency and communion would be positively related to their effectiveness in the group. As can be seen in table 22 in Appendix F, agency was significantly and highly correlated to "influence on effectiveness" ( $R = .86$ ,  $p = .000$ ), "group decisions" ( $R = .91$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and "group process" ( $R = .80$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and "others satisfaction with one's behavior" ( $R = .67$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Communion was significantly and strongly related to "influence on effectiveness" ( $R = .81$ ,  $p = .000$ ), "influence on group decisions" ( $R = .68$ ,  $p = .000$ ), "influence on group process" ( $R = .87$ ,  $p = .000$ ), and "others' satisfaction" ( $R = .91$ ,  $p = .000$ ), as shown in table 23. Tables 22 and 23 also reveal that agency had the strongest positive relation to "influence on decisions" while communion had the strongest relation to "satisfaction with an individual's behavior" and "group process". Thus, hypothesis I was strongly supported.

## 2. Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II predicted that the combination (integration) of an individual's agentic and communal behaviors would be positively related to the individual's assessed effectiveness in the group and would significantly explain the majority of the variation of effectiveness scores. Table 24 reports the results obtained when the combined total scores of agency and communion were correlated with the effectiveness variables. The combination of agency and communion was more strongly correlated with each of the effectiveness variables than either agency or communion totals when compared independently. In addition, the integration of agency and communion had the strongest correlation to "influence on group's effectiveness" ( $R=.93$ ,  $p=.000$ ) and had a relationship ranging from ( $R=.88$ ,  $p=.000$ ) on "others' satisfaction with one's behavior" to ( $R=.92$ ,  $p=.000$ ) on "influence on the group's process". The correlation of the integration of agency and communion on decisions was also strongly positive and significant ( $R=.83$ ,  $p=.000$ ).

Thus, the correlation analyses indicated that the combination of agency and communion had a stronger relationship to the influence effectiveness variables measured, than either determinant by itself, supporting hypothesis II.

To further test whether the combination of agency and communion predicted the effectiveness variables, step-wise multiple regressions were conducted, first using agency and communion as the independent variables and then using the sum of agency and communion totals to predict effectiveness. Table 25 through table 28; in Appendix F report the results when using agency and communion in multiple regressions, first individually and then as a combined value. As can be seen in table 25 through table 32, agency and

communion, entered individually, were significant in predicting all four of the effectiveness variables. Communion was the strongest positive predictor of "satisfaction with an individual's behavior" (Beta .77, B .19,  $p=.000$ ,  $R=.88$ ) and "influence on the group process" (Beta .57, B .23,  $p=.000$ ,  $R=.85$ ). Agency was the strongest positive predictor of "influence on effectiveness" (Beta .58, B .21,  $p=.000$ ,  $R=.85$ ) and "influence on decisions" (Beta .58, B .26,  $p=.000$ ,  $R=.90$ ). However, when we consider the results of using the integration of both agency and communion to predict effectiveness (see table 29 to table 32) we find that the integration of agency and communion was an even stronger predictor of effectiveness than either agency or communion alone. The integration of agency and communion was most predictive of "influence of group effectiveness" (Beta .91, B .20,  $p=.000$ ,  $R=.91$ ). In addition, the integration of agency and communion explained 87% (beta value) of the variance of an individual's score on "influence on group process" and 85% (beta value) of the variation in others' "satisfaction with an individual's behavior".

These results strongly support the prediction of hypothesis II that the combination of an individual's agentic and communal behaviors has a strong positive relationship to effectiveness and significantly predicts an individual's scores on each of the effectiveness variables; i.e., "influence on group process", "decision-making", and "effectiveness" and "others' satisfaction with one's behavior".

### 3. Hypotheses III and IV

Hypothesis III predicted that subjects' agentic behaviors would be positively related to their desire to control others and that knowing an individual's desire to control others would enable one to predict the extent to

which he would exhibit agency. Hypothesis IV predicted that subjects' communal behaviors would be positively related to their desire to be controlled by others and that knowing an individual's desire to be controlled would enable one to predict the extent to which he/she would exhibit communion. Table 33 in Appendix F reports the simple linear relationships found between express-control scores and agency and want-control scores and communion, respectively. An individual's preference to control others as measured by express-control was significantly but weakly and positively correlated to his agentic behavior ( $R = .27, p = .005$ ), while an individual's preference to be controlled by others, as measured by the FIRO-B want-control scale, was significantly but weakly and positively related to communion ( $R = .27, p = .005$ ). While these results are in the direction expected, the weakness in the correlations between the control variables and agency and communion provide only limited support for hypothesis III and IV.

The results of the stepwise multiple regressions conducted, in which express-control was used to predict agentic behavior and want-control was used to predict communal behavior, are indicated in tables 34 to 35. Express-control scores were found significant in their ability to predict an individual's agentic behavior (Beta  $.22$ ,  $B = .69$ ,  $p = .016$ ,  $R = .22$ ), however, they had only a weak positive linear relationship to agency and only accounted for 22% of the variance in an individual's score on agentic behavior. Want-control scores were significant in their ability to predict an individual's communion scores (Beta  $.28$ ,  $B = .72$ ,  $p = .017$ ,  $R = .22$ ). However, the relationship between want-control and communion while positive, was weak ( $R = .22$ ) with want-control only explaining 22% of the variation of communion.



#### 4. Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V predicted that individuals' knowledge of decision issues would increase their influence on the group's decisions, based on research reported by Yukl [Ref. 6]. Table 36 to table 39 in Appendix F show the results of adding knowledge, as an intervening variable, into the multiple regression equations where agency and communion were used to predict effectiveness. If the results in tables 36 to 38 are compared with the results reported in tables 25 to 27, one finds adding knowledge into the equation with agency and communion to predict effectiveness causes the relative beta weights of agency and communion to decrease for "influence on effectiveness, "influence on group process" and "influence on group decisions". However, in each case it is the weight of the agentic variable that is decreased to a greater extent; i.e., when adding knowledge to predict "influence on effectiveness" agency's beta weight changes from Beta .58 to Beta .39, agency changes from Beta .80 to .54 on "influence on group decisions" and it changes from Beta .43 to Beta .29 on "influence on group process". While communion beta weights change with the addition of knowledge as well, the largest difference between communion beta weights is .029 on "influence on group process". (No additional analysis was conducted involving the change in agency or communion scores, however, these findings may be interesting to pursue in further research.) In terms of "satisfaction with an individual's behavior", the addition of knowledge into the equation was not at all helpful, i.e., it was insignificant.

Thus, hypothesis V was partially supported in that knowledge did improve the predictability of effectiveness when added to the regression equation, for all of the effectiveness measures, except "satisfaction with an individual's

behavior". However, the inclusion of knowledge caused the predictive values of both communion and agency to decrease with the reduction in agency's predictive weight in the equation being as much as 25% (beta).

## 5. Hypothesis VI

Finally hypothesis VI predicted that the relative degree of agency and communion an individual displayed would impact on how effective and influential he/she was perceived by other group members. The results of a T-test comparison of the differences in mean control scores as well as between the differences in mean effectiveness scores between those individuals who were low (below the mean) on both agency and communion with those who were high (above the mean) on both agency and communion are detailed in tables 40 to 42. These results indicate that individuals who had high agency and communion scores had significantly different effectiveness scores, i.e., their scores were significantly higher on "influence on group decisions" ( $p = .000$ ) "effectiveness" ( $p = .000$ ) and "process" ( $p = .000$ ) than those individuals who were low on both agency and communion. This result strongly supports that part of hypothesis VI that predicts that the degree of combined agency and communion individuals exhibit will be significantly related to the degree to which they are considered to be effective in influencing others. The second part of hypothesis VI, that individuals high in agency and communion would have express-control scores and want-control scores that were moderate in range and significantly different from the control scores of individuals low in agency and communion, was not totally supported. While the individuals high on agency and high on communion did have control scores that were in the 'moderate' range (from 3 to 6, see Appendix D), the individuals low on agency and communion had lower control scores but these scores were

within the moderate range as well. The results of conducting a T-test to measure the significance of the differences in control scores between those high on both agency and communion and those low on both determinants are shown in tables 41 and 42. The results reveal that there was no significant difference in the mean scores of either group. However, a similar test conducted which compared the differences in the mean control scores of those individuals high on agency and low on communion with those low on agency and high on communion did result in significant differences, (for express-control,  $p = .0107$ , and for want-control,  $p = .0908$ ; see table 43).

Finally it was found that there was no significant difference between the want and express control scores of individuals high on both agency and communion, nor was there a significant difference between express/want control scores of individuals low on both agency and communion. In other words, the want/express scores within both high/high and low/low categories were very close, indicating that individuals in either category were fairly flexible in their ability to switch from want to express control modes (see table 40 to table 42).

Thus, while the results when comparing the effectiveness scores of the different sample quartiles strongly support the prediction that the relative degree of agency plus communion impact on the degree to which individuals are considered effective; the results when comparing differences in control scores do not provide support for the prediction that only individuals high on both agency and communion have moderate control scores. These results also don't support the prediction that the differences between the express and want control scales for only those individuals high on both agency and communion would be insignificant. Should this later prediction have been supported, it would have implied

that the only individuals with highly integrated behavioral styles would be most flexible in their abilities to balance controlling with being controlled (see Appendix D).



## VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

### A. SUMMARY OF STUDY AND ITS RESULTS

In the first part of this chapter the questions researched in this thesis study are reviewed and the results summarized. The next section discusses the methodological issues concerning the research conducted. The final section of this chapter includes the researcher's conclusions and addresses the implications for the Navy leader based on the study's findings.

This study examined several related questions:

1. Is there a relationship between agentic and communal behaviors (individually and combined) and how individuals are assessed in terms of their influence in work groups?
2. Is there a relationship between agentic and communal behaviors and individual preferences to control or be controlled?
3. Is there a relationship between high combined total agency/communion scores and effectiveness?
4. Is there a relationship between one's knowledge and one's influence on group decisions?
5. Is there a relationship between high combined agency/communion scores and the preference to both express and want control, i.e., to control and be controlled?

This study's results indicate that:

1. Agency and communion bear a very strong positive relationship to influence. In fact, the combination of agency and communion was found to be even more predictive of influence effectiveness than either

determinant alone; with agency having the greatest impact (positive) on "influence upon the group's decisions" and communion having the greatest impact (positive) on "influence upon the group's process", "the group's effectiveness", and "others' satisfaction".

2. The combination of agentic and communal behaviors have an even stronger relationship to effectiveness than either agency or communion alone and are more helpful in predicting effectiveness ratings than either determinant by itself.
3. Agentic behavior is weakly but significantly and positively correlated with express-control and communion is weakly but significantly and positively related to want-control.
4. Individuals with high agency and high communion have significantly higher effectiveness scores than individuals low on both determinants.
5. Knowledge of decision issues is an important positive moderating variable on the relationship between agency/communion and influence.
6. Individuals high on agency and communion are not the only individuals who have express/want control scores that are moderate in range (see Appendix C), nor whose differences between express and want scales are insignificant.

After reviewing some of the methodological factors that may have affected the results, this chapter examines the results in relation to the questions this research hoped to illuminate and discusses their implications for the Navy leader.

## 1. Methodological Issues

There are several methodological issues that will be discussed here. First, however, an important cautionary note is that the importance of knowledge of decision issues and the extent to which individuals were found to exhibit both high agency and high communion (41 out of 120) in this research may be characteristic of the particular sample studied. That is, the results regarding knowledge and the integration of agentic and communal behaviors, may be attributable to the sample's experience level, mean level of years on active duty of 15.3 and mean paygrade of middle grade officers and petty officers, e.g., lieutenants and first class petty officers. For it is possible that in a sample with a lower mean experience and professional level that, knowledge would play a less significant role and lesser degrees of high agency and communion would be displayed.

Given the sample studied, there are several additional unexpected results that must be addressed here. The first concerns the lack of consistency between the self-scores and the scores given to individuals by others on the ISQ. While it was found that self and other scores on agency were significantly though weakly correlated ( $R=.29$ ,  $p=.002$ ), self/other scores on communion were not ( $R=.01$ ,  $p=.448$ ). In a similar fashion, while express-control scores were similarly related to agency whether rated by the individuals themselves or by others, want-control scores were only related to communion scores as scored by others. And while communion and agency self-scores were predictive of self-scores on the various effectiveness variables as were others' agency and communion scores predictive of how others' rated individuals on effectiveness; self-scores on the independent and dependent variables were not predictive

of how others scored individuals. (The only exception to this was that self-scores on "influence on group decisions" predicted others' scores on "influence on group's decisions" and "effectiveness".) These inconsistent results suggest that individuals assess their own behaviors differently from the way others view them.

Such inconsistencies when comparing self and others ratings are not unusual. The lack of correspondence between leaders' and subordinates' ratings has been observed by others [Ref. 49] [Ref. 50], using measuring instruments other than those employed in the study reported here. The results reported in other studies, along with the results reported by this researcher, suggest that the two methods of rating individual behaviors can not be treated the same. However, for the purposes of this study, which was concerned with an individual's perceived influence effectiveness based on how others viewed his/her agentic and/or communal behaviors, others' ratings were used. The logic for using the ratings of others versus self-ratings is further supported if one considers that the amount of influence an individual exerts is to a great degree dependent upon whether others are willing to be influenced, and individuals are open to being influenced depending on how they interpret the influencer's intentions and behaviors. [Ref. 51] The discrepancy of leader/follower results found in this study, however, does suggest that in future studies an additional means for assessing influence behaviors could be employed, e.g., observers.

As discussed above, it is not uncommon to find differences in self and others ratings. But while such results are not uncommon, there are some reasons why individuals' own scores and the scores of others differed in this research. One possible explanation for the differences in self and others scores is suggested if we consider the



fact that the self and other scores found to be related in any way were those for agency. Given the context in which the study was conducted, i.e., military organizations; it is plausible that traditional, 'heroic', 'agentic' behaviors (i.e., being forceful and strongly supporting one's own opinion) were more highly valued or rewarded by the U.S. Navy groups studied. If one accepts such a theory, (i.e., in a military group agentic behaviors, like getting one's views on the table in order for decisions to be made and the task to accomplished), it is reasonable to propose that agentic behaviors would be considered to be more 'appropriate' in Navy group settings, and therefore Navy group members would exhibit a greater degree of agency than communion. If agentic behaviors were considered more 'appropriate', then individual members might be more aware of them and willing to admit to their existence, since exhibiting agency would be most valued by the overall Navy organization. Using this line of reasoning provides an explanation for the discrepancy between communion self and other ratings as well. For if individuals believed that communal behaviors were less valued than agentic behaviors, they might be more hesitant to report communal tendencies, might tend to score themselves lower on communion and might indeed work to minimize communal behaviors when interacting in a group. Despite attempts to minimize communal tendencies, however, other group members would be sensitive to any communal behaviors displayed, since even if exhibited to a small degree, communal behaviors would be contrary to organizational 'values' and thus be noticeable. Using the line of reasoning that agency is most consistent with Navy organizational norms, it makes sense that agency whether rated by individuals themselves or by others, was most predictive of "influence on decision-making", and that self ratings on "influence on decisionmaking" were most predictive of all

the dependent variables ("influence on decision-making", "effectiveness", and "process") as rated by others.

Support for the researcher's proposal that agentic behaviors might have been considered more appropriate in a military group are also found when one considers the sample control scores. While individuals want-control scores were correlated with how others rated them on communion, they were not correlated with self ratings on communion. (At this point it is important to clarify that the FIRO-B scores on want and express control are obtained by having subjects answer questions that concern individual preferences to control or be controlled.) Thus, control score correlations also revealed that communion self and other scores differed substantially as opposed to agency self/other scores. The fact that others' scores on communion were correlated with an individual's own want-control preferences while self scores on communion were not is puzzling, but explainable. Individuals might know and admit they preferred being controlled, following orders and not assuming responsibility because following orders for example, is highly valued by a military organization. At the same time however, the fact that these same people were members of an organization that rewarded performance with increased leadership responsibilities and in which leadership styles that used agentic, forceful behaviors might be more 'appropriate' could prohibit them from admitting to communal (nurturing) behaviors. Still, while individuals might be conflicted about expressing control and be willing to admit this because following orders is valued by the military, their want-control preferences could result in their exhibiting communal behaviors to a greater degree than they might realize. Once again while the communal behaviors displayed might go unrecognized by the individuals themselves, they would be noticed by others because they were inconsistent

with organizational values and norms. Thus, in explaining why individual's own ratings on want-control preferences were more consistent with others' ratings on communion than with their own ratings on their communal tendencies, the overall assumption is that individuals are experts when it comes to their own motives and preferences for wanting or expressing control but they are not experts in assessing the impact of their own behaviors on others.

There are still other findings concerning self/other scores that support the researcher's contention that an individual's behavior was judged differently depending on whether it was evaluated by the individual himself or by others. In addition, these findings, which will be discussed next, suggest that the term "influence" when referring to an individual's overall influence in the group was conceptualized primarily in terms of impact on decision-making by the participants in this thesis research. It was found that while self and other dependent variables ("influence on process", "decisions", "effectiveness" and "satisfaction") were not predictive of each other, an individual's rating on his own "overall influence in the group" was predictive of both self and other scores on all the various influence effectiveness scales. (Overall influence was assessed by evaluating the replies of each group member to a question which asked them to rate their overall influence in the group using a scale of 1,3 or 5, in which the definition of influence was not specified.) The fact that self and other ratings on specific influence abilities were not predictive of each other, but that self ratings on "general influence" predicted self and other influence effectiveness measures, means that while individuals' own ratings on "overall influence" captured some of the variance of the self and others' scores on the specific effectiveness measures, the portion of the variation captured that was

common to both self and other ratings was small. While these results seem puzzling, they become understandable if we consider that only self ratings on "influence on decision-making" were at all predictive of any of the ratings of an individual's effectiveness as assessed by others and that agency was the strongest predictor of "influence on decision-making", regardless of who rated the individual. Given the relationships just described, it makes sense that "overall influence" captured those aspects concerning agency and "influence on decision-making" commonly assessed by both individuals themselves as well as by other raters.

Finally, there was one additional result that was not anticipated. This was that regardless of which quartile (high agency/low communion, low agency/high communion, high on both or low on both) individuals' combined scores were in, their FIRO-B scores on express and want control all fell into the "moderate" range (see Appendix D). It had been expected that only individuals high on both agency and communion would have control scores that reflected a moderate need for control, i.e., a tendency to be democratic (again see Appendix D). The fact that all of the sample population had control scores that were moderate, may have resulted because the moderate range of FIRO-B scores had the largest number of scales, (3-6 inclusive) versus the low range (0-2) and the high range (7-9). Since the moderate range was the largest, maybe more subtle differences in scores were not able to be assessed. Despite the differences in the ranges of moderate, low and high FIRO control scores, the results do show that express-control scores were predictive of agency and want-control scores were predictive of communion, but that these control scores accounted for less than 25% of the variation in agency or communion, respectively. Since express-control was only weakly related



to agency and want-control was only weakly related to communion, it might have been that only individuals with very high or very low scores on both agency and communion could have significantly different mean control scores. Support for this assumption can be found if one considers that there was a significant difference between the mean scores on both express-control and want-control when comparing those individuals high on agency and low on communion with those low on agency and high on communion. Given the fact that the differences in control scores were significant between groups that were low/high on agency/communion it is plausible to suggest that while express-control and want-control needs are related to agency and communion, respectively, only in very extreme cases would these preferences become distinct enough to be significant.

## B. DISCUSSION

What is interesting about this study is that individuals exhibiting an integration of both high degrees of agency and high degrees of communion were found to have the highest mean scores on all of the effectiveness variables, while individuals low on both determinants had the lowest scores on all of the effectiveness variables. These findings strongly support the hypothesis of this study that the integration of agency and communion in an individual's influence behavioral style leads to greater effectiveness. (Where effectiveness has been defined as the ability to be perceived as having the most influence on how the group works together, i.e., process; the quality of group decisions, i.e., effectiveness; the kinds of decisions made, i.e., decision-making; and others' satisfaction with one's behavior.

The results indicate that the integration of one's own ideas 'self' or agency, coupled with a willingness to allow others to express their 'selves' or communion, will lead to increased effectiveness. But, what is especially interesting about this study of effective behavior, and what has organizational implications applicable to the Navy, according to predictions made by Argyris concerning the individual and organization, is that "willingness to express uncertainty" was included in the definition of communal behavior, in addition to the more traditional concept of "concern for others". Since this study found communal behavior to be a significant predictor of effectiveness in Navy decision-making groups, and the need for being controlled to be related, although weakly, to communal behavior, let's consider the organizational implications for the Navy of including "willingness to express uncertainty" in the definition of communion.

If individuals are going to be able to allow others to have an impact on the decisions made, learn from others and be open to others' influence, they must be able to admit that they don't always have the answers and can't always be in control of the situation. The ability to show some vulnerability and seek the suggestions of subordinates allows a leader to gain their commitment and trust and opens up the opportunity for subordinates to learn and develop. The consequences of such "developing" on the part of the manager are that subordinates feel like their contributions count, increasing the chances that subordinates will put forth an extra effort [Ref. 34].

The integration of agency and communion to achieve greater effectiveness offers a powerful tool for improving the overall effectiveness of Navy decision-making groups. For if group members, particularly group leaders are able to express their ideas and listen to the ideas of others, i.e.,

to remain flexible in their ability to control which issues are considered in arriving at a decision; issues can be more efficiently and thoroughly explored. If individuals feel free enough to be agentic as well as communal, to exert their 'selves' and be influenced by 'others', they can address the issues at hand instead of getting lost in a struggle for control of the conversation. Further, when group members are able to explore issues without worrying about protecting themselves, the leader is not only able to get 'his' job done, but also gains the willful commitment of his troops, for they are given an ability to impact organizational outcomes, rather than merely feeling like organizational 'pawns'. [Ref. 38].

In fact, the integration of agency and communion, underpinned by an ability to both exert the self and be influenced by others can be revolutionary, if it allows individuals not only the opportunity to do 'their' jobs but enables them to see a deeper meaning in their task in relationship to the overall mission of their command. Given the leadership challenges facing our modern day Navy and the fact that our abilities both technically and personally, may indeed make the ultimate difference in our ability to stand strong against our foes, the ability to function as a cohesive, effective, committed, professional team is paramount. Thus, in order to inspire our personnel so they achieve excellence, it is this researcher's conclusion that instead of seeking to adopt "popular" management techniques like Japanese 'quality circles', the Navy leader must value and exhibit both agentic and communal behaviors. For if leaders can integrate these two behavioral strategies, they will be more effective in influencing others, gaining subordinate commitment and trust, and achieving excellence versus mediocrity.

APPENDIX A  
QUESTIONS, SCALES, AND RELIABILITY STATISTICS

Agency 1 (A1) - Self-assertion, .e.g., proposes how the group should work together (Questions: 10, 21, 31, 8)

Cronbach Alpha: .95403 (other) .75191 (self)

Proposes a schedule for the work to be done

Proposes definite standards of performance

Proposes procedures for the group to follow

Recommends ways for the group to work

Agency 2 (A2) - Self-expansion, e.g., tries to dominate (Questions: 1, 16, 13, 19)

Cronbach Alpha: .84906 (other) .68090 (self)

Talks a lot

Participates actively

Speaks forcefully

Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group

Agency 3 (A3) - Self-protection, e.g., defends self (Questions: 25, 5, 29)

Cronbach Alpha: .97309 (other) .84301 (self)

Argues strongly for his/her point of view

Defends own point of view with strength

Energetically argues for position he or she supports



Agency Total (AT) = A1 + A2 + A3

Cronbach Alpha: .95931(other) .85646(self)

Communion 1 (C1) - Selflessness, e.g., helpful to others and facilitates others' participation (Questions: 4,15,33,23,27)

Cronbach Alpha: .92166 (other) .64440 (self)

Is sensitive to the needs of others

Shows interest in others' ideas

Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them

Tries to keep communication lines open between members

Is willing to make changes in response to others' opinions

Communion 2 (C2) - Selflessness, e.g., discloses own vulnerabilities (Questions: 11,35,14,38)

Cronbach Alpha: .95371 (other) .76155 (self)

Admits own errors

Is willing to express uncertainty about a particular issue

Is willing to state that he or she may be wrong Is honest about own mistakes

Communion 3 (C3) - Selflessness, e.g., tries to create solidarity in the group (Questions: 12,17)

Cronbach Alpha: .85865 (other) .61998 (self)

Tries to build harmonious relationships

Tries to keep the group working together as a team

Communion Total (CT) = C1 + C2 + C3

Cronbach Alpha: .91558(other) .81541(self)

Knowledge of Decision Issues (K) -Has a good deal of experience with the kinds of issues we discuss in this group  
(Questions: 32,26,32)

Cronbach Alpha:.97623(other) .87158(self)

Has a lot of knowledge that is applicable to our group task

Has a good background with the kinds of issues we discuss

Satisfaction with Behavioral Style (s) - (Questions: 28,9)

Cronbach Alpha:.95906(other) .45915(self)

I feel satisfied with his/her manner of communicating with the group

I support his/her way of interacting in the group

Degree of Influence on Group's Decision(ID)- (Questions: 34,20,7,12)

Cronbach Alpha: .96340(other) .81308(self)

Is able to get the group to go along with his/her way of thinking

Has a significant impact on what we decide

His/her ideas end up as a significant component of our final decisions

Degree of Positive Influence on the Group's Process (P)  
(Questions: 37,3,24)

Cronbach Alpha: .95299 (other) .82343 (self)

Has a positive influence on the working relations among members

Has a positive influence on the climate of the group

Is influential on how well group members communicate with one another

Has an impact on how open members of the group are with each other about important issues

Degree of Positive Influence on Group's Effectiveness (IE)  
(Questions: 30,18,22,6)

Cronbach Alpha:.96838 (other) .89089 (self)

Positively influences the effectiveness of our group

Is a valuable member of this group

Has a positive impact on the effectiveness of this group

Is an important contributor to this group.

## APPENDIX B

### ISQ

#### Influence Style Questionnaire

by Esther E. Hamilton

administered by Lt. Christine McMahon, USNR

Naval Post Graduate School

Monterey, California

#### INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire asks for your perceptions of the behavior of another member of your group. For each item choose the alternative which most nearly expresses your perception of that individual. Answer the item by circling the appropriate number. Circle only one number.

Please answer every item. The completion of this questionnaire is strictly voluntary. The research data collected will be used for research purposes only.

Please use the space between questions to make comments that may clarify your response to an item.

A sample of the kind of question you'll find in this questionnaire follows.

8. Recommends definite ways for      1      2      3      4      5      6      7  
the group to work

If you slightly disagree with this statement regarding the person you are rating, then you would circle the number 3 for question 8.



|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Talks a lot   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | Tries to build harmonious relationships   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | Has a significant impact on what we decide  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | Is sensitive to the needs of others   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | Defends own point of view with strength   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | Has an impact on group members' openness and honesty with each other about important issues | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | Has a positive impact on the effectiveness of the group                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | Recommends definite ways for the group to work  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

|     |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9.  | His/Her way of interacting in the group has my support | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | Proposes a schedule for the work to be done            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Admits own errors                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | Is an important contributor to this group              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | Speaks forcefully                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | Is willing to state that he or she may be wrong        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | Shows interest in others' work                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | Participates actively                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

17. Tries to keep the group working together as a team. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Has a positive influence on the climate of the group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. Is a valuable member of the group. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. Proposes definite standards of performance 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. Is influential on how well group members communicate with one another 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Tries to keep communication lines open between members 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. His/her ideas end up as a significant component of the group's final decisions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Argues strongly for his/her own point  
cf view 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. Has a lot of knowledge that is  
applicable to the group task 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. Is willing to make changes in  
response to others' opinions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. His/her manner of communicating  
with the group is satisfactory to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. Energetically argues for a position  
he or she supports 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. Has a positive influence on  
working relations among group members 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. Proposes procedures for the group to  
follow 1 2 3 4 5 6 7



32. Has had a good deal of experience with the kinds of issues discussed in the group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. Positively influences the effectiveness of the group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. Is willing to express uncertainty about a particular issue 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. Has a good background with the kinds of issues discussed in the group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. Is able to get the group to go along with his/her way of thinking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. Is honest about his or her own mistakes 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX C  
ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL POWER

INSTRUCTIONS : PLEASE COMPLETE THE "FIRO-B" QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN BELOW. BE SURE TO READ THE INSTRUCTIONS AT THE TOP. REMEMBER THAT THERE ARE NO RIGHT ANSWERS; YOU SHOULD ATTEMPT TO DESCRIBE HOW YOU ACTUALLY BEHAVE, NOT WHAT YOU THINK SOMEONE ELSE WANTS YOU TO SAY.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS DESIGNED TO HELP YOU EXPLORE THE TYPICAL WAYS YOU INTERACT WITH PEOPLE. THERE ARE, OF COURSE, NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. EACH PERSON HAS HIS OWN WAYS OF BEHAVING. SOMETIMES PEOPLE ARE TEMPTED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS LIKE THESE IN TERMS OF WHAT THEY THINK A PERSON SHOULD DO. THIS IS NOT WHAT IS DESIRED HERE. THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS AN ATTEMPT TO HELP YOU LEARN MORE ABOUT YOURSELF AND HOW YOU ACTUALLY BEHAVE. SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT FOLLOW MAY SEEM SIMILAR TO OTHERS. HOWEVER, EACH IS DIFFERENT SO PLEASE ANSWER EACH ONE WITHOUT REGARD TO THE OTHERS.

COMPLETION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS STRICTLY VOLUNTARY. THE INFORMATION COLLECTED WILL BE USED FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

FOR EACH STATEMENT BELOW, DECIDE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ANSWERS BEST APPLIES TO YOU. PLEASE PLACE THE NUMBER OF THE ANSWER AT THE LEFT OF THE STATEMENT. BE HONEST WITH YOURSELF.

1.USUALLY 2.OFTEN 3.SOMETIMES 4.OCCASIONALLY 5.RARELY 6.NEVER

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I try to be with people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I let other people decide what to do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I join social groups.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I try to have close relationships with people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. I try to be included in informal social activities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. I try to include other people in my plans.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. I let other people control my actions.

1.USUALLY 2.OFTEN 3.SOMETIMES 4.OCCASIONALLY 5.RARELY 6.NEVER

\_\_\_\_\_ 11. I try to have people around me.

\_\_\_\_\_ 12. I try to get close and personal with people.

\_\_\_\_\_ 13. When people are doing things together I tend to  
join them.

\_\_\_\_\_ 14. I am easily led by people.

\_\_\_\_\_ 15. I try to avoid being alone.

\_\_\_\_\_ 16. I try to participate in group activities.

FOR EACH OF THE NEXT GROUP OF STATEMENTS, CHOOSE ONE OF THE  
FOLLOWING ANSWERS:

1.USUALLY 2.OFTEN 3.SOMETIMES 4.OCCASIONALLY 5.RARELY 6.NEVER

\_\_\_\_\_ 17. I try to be friendly to people.

\_\_\_\_\_ 18. I let other people decide what to do.

\_\_\_\_\_ 19. My personal relations with people are cool and  
distant

\_\_\_\_\_ 20. I let other people take charge of things.



1.USUALLY 2.OFTEN 3.SOMETIMES 4.OCCASIONALLY 5.RARELY 6.NEVER

\_\_\_\_\_21. I try to have close relationships with people.

\_\_\_\_\_22. I let other people strongly influence my actions.

\_\_\_\_\_23. I try to get close and personal with people.

\_\_\_\_\_24. I let other people control my actions.

\_\_\_\_\_25. I act cool and distant with people.

\_\_\_\_\_26. I am easily led by people.

\_\_\_\_\_27. I try to have close, personal relationships  
with people

FOR EACH OF THE NEXT GROUP OF STATEMENTS, CHOOSE ONE OF THE  
FOLLOWING ANSWERS:

1.MOST 2.MANY 3.SOME 4.A FEW 5.ONE OR TWO 6.NOBODY

\_\_\_\_\_28. I like people to invite me to things.

\_\_\_\_\_29. I like people to act close and personal with me.

\_\_\_\_\_30. I try to influence strongly other people's  
actions.

1.MOST 2.MANY 3.SOME 4.A FEW 5.ONE OR TWO 6.NOBODY

\_\_\_\_\_31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities.

\_\_\_\_\_32. I like people to act close toward me.

\_\_\_\_\_33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.

\_\_\_\_\_34. I like people to include me in activities.

\_\_\_\_\_35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.

\_\_\_\_\_36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.

\_\_\_\_\_37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.

\_\_\_\_\_38. I like people to include me in their activities.

\_\_\_\_\_39. I like people to act friendly toward me.

\_\_\_\_\_40. I like people to act distant toward me.

FOR EACH OF THE NEXT GROUP OF STATEMENTS, CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING ANSWERS:

1.USUALLY 2.OFTEN 3.SOMETIMES 4.OCCASIONALLY 5.RARELY 6.NEVER

\_\_\_\_\_41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.

\_\_\_\_\_42. I like people to invite me to things.

\_\_\_\_\_43. I like people to act close toward me.

\_\_\_\_\_44. I try to have other people do things I want done.

\_\_\_\_\_45. I like people to invite to join their activities.

\_\_\_\_\_46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.

\_\_\_\_\_47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.

\_\_\_\_\_48. I like people to include me in their activities.

\_\_\_\_\_49. I like people to act close and personal with me.

\_\_\_\_\_50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.

1.USUALLY 2.OFTEN 3.SOMETIMES 4.OCCASIONALLY 5.RARELY 6.NEVER

\_\_\_\_\_51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.

\_\_\_\_\_52. I like people to act distant toward me.

\_\_\_\_\_53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.

\_\_\_\_\_54. I take charge of things when I'm with people.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX D  
THE FIRO READER

Fundamental Interpersonal- Relations Orientation

U.S. ARMY SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER

FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON, INDIANA 46216

The theory behind Firo-B is based on the assumption that all human behavior may be divided into three categories: issues surrounding "inclusion," issues surrounding "control" and issues surrounding "openness." The Firo-B questionnaire measures the interpersonal areas- inclusion, control and affection- the direction of behavior- what the individual "expresses" to others, and what the individual "wants" from others. The fundamental interpersonal dimensions of the theory- Inclusion (I), Control (C), and Openness (O) are defined behaviorally in the next section.

A. THE DEFINITIONS OF THE INTERPERSONAL DIMENSIONS

1. Inclusion

Inclusion is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people in terms of interaction and association. Satisfactory relation includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from originating or initiating interaction with all people to not initiating interaction with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always initiating interaction with the self to never initiating interaction with the self. Some people like to be with other people all the time; they want to belong to organizations, to interact, to



mingle. Other people seek much less contact; they prefer to be alone, to interact minimally, to stay out of groups, to maintain privacy. If a continuum were to be drawn between these two extremes every person could be placed at a point at which he feels most comfortable. Thus, to a certain degree, each individual is trying to belong to a group, but he is also trying to maintain a certain amount of privacy. From the other point of view, he wishes to some degree to have people initiate interaction toward him through invitations and the like, and also wishes to some degree that people would leave him alone. Statements that connote expressed inclusion are: "I make efforts to include other people in my activities and to get them to include me in theirs", and "I try to belong, to join social groups, and to be with people as much as possible". Statements that connote wanted inclusion are: "I want other people to include me in their activities", and "I want other people to invite me to belong, even if I don't make an effort to be included". Some terms that suggest positive inclusion are "associate, interact, mingle, companion, belong, communicate, comrade, attend to, join, member, togetherness, extravert, interested, pay attention to, encounter." Negative inclusion is suggested by "exclude, isolate, outsider, outcast, lonely, detached, withdrawn, abandon, ignore."

The need to be included manifests itself as wanting to be attended to, to attract attention and interest. The classroom hellion who throws erasers is often objecting mostly to the lack of attention paid to him. Even if he is given negative affection he is partially satisfied, because at least someone is paying attention to him. In groups, people often make themselves prominent by talking a great deal. Frequently they are not interested in power or dominance but simply prominence. The joker is an example of a prominence seeker, very much as the blond actress with the lavender convertible.

In the extreme, what is called fame is primarily inclusion. Acquisition of fame does not imply acquisition of power or influence: witness Marilyn Monroe's attempt to swing votes to Adlai Stevenson. Nor does fame imply affection: Al Capone could hardly be considered a widely loved figure. But fame does imply prominence, and signifies interest on the part of others.

From another standpoint, behavior related to belonging and togetherness is primarily inclusion. To desire to belong to a fraternal organization by no means is often sought for its prestige value, but for an increase status. These terms are also primarily inclusion conceptions, because their primary implication is that people pay attention to the person, know who he is, and can distinguish him from others.

The last point leads to an essential aspect of inclusion, that of identity. An integral part of being recognized and paid attention to is that the individual be identifiable from other people. He must be known as a specific individual and he must have a particular identity. If he is not thus known, he cannot truly be attended to have interest paid to him. The extreme of this identification is that he be understood. To be understood implies that someone is interested enough in him to find out his particular characteristics. Again, this interest need not mean that others have a liking for him, or that they respect him. For example, the interested person may be a confident man who is exploring his background to find a point of vulnerability.

At the outset of interpersonal relations a common issue is that of commitment, the decision to become involved in a given relation or activity. Usually, in the initial testing of the relation, individuals try to identify themselves to one another to find out which facet of themselves

others will be interested in. Frequently a member is silent for a while because he is not sure that people are interested in him. These behaviors, too are primarily in the inclusion area.

This, then, is the flavor of inclusion. It has to do with interacting with people, with attention, acknowledgment, being known, prominence, recognition, prestige, status, and fame; with identity, individuality, understanding, interest, commitment, and participation. It is unlike openness in that it does not involve strong emotional attachments to individual persons. It is unlike control in that the preoccupation is with prominence, not dominance.

## 2. Control

Control is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to influence and power. Control refers to the decision-making process between people.

A satisfactory relation includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from always being controlled by them. In other words, every individual has a desire to control his situation to some degree, so that his environment can be predictable for him. Ordinarily this amounts to controlling other people, because other people are the main agents which threaten him and create an unpredictable and uncontrollable situation. This need for control varies from those who want to control their environment, including all the people around them, to those who want to control no one in any situation, no matter how appropriate controlling them would be. Here again, everyone varies as to the degree to which he wants to control others. In addition, everyone varies with respect to the degree to which he wants to be controlled by other people, from those who want to be

completely controlled and are dependent on others for making decisions for them to those who want to be controlled under no conditions. Statements that connote expressed control are: "I want to exert control and influence over things", "I take charge of things", and "I tell other people what to do". Statements that connote wanted control are: "I want others to control and influence me", and "I want other people to tell me what to do".

Terms that suggest positive control are "power, authority, dominance, control, influence, ruler, superior, officer, leader." Negative control is suggested by "rebellion, resistance, follower, anarchy, submissive, henpecked, milque toast."

The need for control manifests itself as the desire for power, authority, and control over others and therefore over one's future. At the other end is the need to be controlled, to have responsibility taken away. Manifestations of the power drive are very clear. A more subtle form is exemplified by the current magazine advertising campaign featuring "the influential". This is a person who controls others through the power he has to influence their behavior.

The acquisition of money or political power is a direct method of obtaining control over another person. This type of control often involves coercion rather than more subtle methods of influence like persuasion, for example. In group behavior, the struggles to achieve high office or to make suggestions that are adopted are manifestations of control behavior. In an argument in a group we may distinguish the inclusion seeker from the control seeker in a way: the one seeking inclusion or prominence wants very much to be one of the participants in the argument, while the control seeker wants to be the winner or, if not the winner, on the same side as the winner. The prominence



seeker would prefer to be the losing participant; the dominance seeker would prefer to be a winning nonparticipant. Both these roles are separate from the openness desire of the members.

Control behavior takes many subtle forms, especially among more intellectual and polite people. For example, in many discussion groups where blackboards are involved, the power struggle becomes displaced onto the chalk. Walking to the blackboard and taking the chalk from the one holding it, and retaining possession, becomes a mark of competitive success. Often a meeting is marked by a procession of men taking the chalk, writing something, and being supplanted by another man for a further message. In this way propriety is maintained, and still the power struggle may proceed.

In many gatherings, control behavior is exhibited through the group task. Intellectual superiority, for one thing, often leads to control over others so that strong motivation to achieve is often largely control behavior. Such superiority also demonstrates the real capacity of the individual to be relied on for responsible jobs, a central aspect of control. Further, to do one's job properly, or to rebel against the established authority structure by not doing it, is a splendid outlet for control feelings. Doing a poor job is a way of rebelling against the structure and showing that no one will control you, whereas acquiescence earns rewards from those in charge, which satisfies the need to be respected for one's accomplishments.

Control is also manifested in behavior toward others controlling the self. Expression of independence and rebellion exemplify lack of willingness to be controlled, while compliance, submission, and taking orders indicate various degrees of accepting the control of others. There is no necessary relation between an individual's behavior toward controlling others and his behavior toward being controlled.



The domineering sergeant may accept orders from the lieutenant with pleasure and gratefulness, while the neighborhood bully may also rebel against his parents; two persons who control others differ in the degree to which they allow others to control them.

Thus the flavor of control is transmitted by behavior involving influence, leadership, power, coercion, authority, accomplishment, intellectual superiority, high achievement, and independence, as well as dependence (for decision-making), rebellion, resistance, and submission. It differs from inclusion behavior in that it does not require prominence. The concept of the power behind the throne is an excellent example of a role that would fill a high control need and low need for inclusion. The joker exemplifies the opposite. Control behavior differs from openness behavior in that it has to do with power relations rather than emotional closeness. The frequent difficulties between those who want to get down to business and those who want to get to know one another illustrate a situation in which control behavior is more important for some and openness behavior for others.

### 3. Openness

Openness is the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with others in terms of love and affection. Openness always refers to a two-person (dyadic relation). A satisfactory open relation includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with others somewhere on a dimension ranging from initiating close, personal relations with everyone to originating close, personal relations with no one; and (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them on a dimension ranging from always originating close, personal relations toward the self to never originating close,

personal relations toward the self. In the business setting this need is seldom made overt. It takes the form of friendship. In essence, openness is a relationship between two people only, a dyadic relationship. At one extreme individuals like very close, personal relationships with each individual they meet. At the other extreme are those who like their personal relationships to be quite impersonal and distant, perhaps friendly but not close and intimate. Again, between these two extremes everyone has a level of intimacy which is most comfortable for him. From the other side, each individual prefers that others make overtures to him in a way that indicates a certain degree of closeness. Statements that connote expressed openness are: "I make efforts to become close to people," "I express friendly and affectionate feelings," and "I try to be personal and intimate". Statements that connote wanted openness are: "I want others to express friendly and affectionate feelings toward me," and "I want others to try to become close to me".

Terms that suggest positive openness are "love, like, emotionally close, personal, friend, intimate, sweetheart." Negative openness is suggested by "hate, cool, dislike, rejecting, emotionally distant." The need for openness leads to behavior related to becoming emotionally close. An open relation must be dyadic because it involves strong differentiation between people. Open relations can be toward parental figures, peers or childish figures. They are exemplified in friendship relations, dating and marriage. To become emotionally close to someone involves closeness, in addition to there being an emotional attachment, an element of conflicting innermost anxieties, wishes, and feelings must be present. A strong positive open tie usually is accompanied by a unique relation regarding the degree of sharing of these feelings.

In groups, openness behavior is characterized by overtures of friendship and differentiation between members. One common method for avoiding a close tie with any one member is to be equally friendly to all members. Thus popularity may not involve openness at all; it may often be inclusion behavior, whereas going steady is usually primarily openness.

A difference between openness behavior, inclusion behavior, and control behavior is illustrated by the different feelings a man has in being turned down by a fraternity, failed in a course by a professor and rejected by his girl. The fraternity, excludes him and tells him, in effect, that they as a group don't have sufficient interest in him. The professor fails him and says, in effect, that he finds him incompetent in his field. His girl rejects him and tells him, in effect, that she doesn't find him lovable.

Thus the flavor of openness is embodied in situations of love, emotional closeness, personal confidences, and intimacy. Negative openness is characterized by hate, hostility and emotional rejection.

In order to sharpen further the contrast between those three types of behavior, several differences may be mentioned. With respect to an interpersonal relation, inclusion is concerned primarily with the formation of the relation, whereas control and openness are concerned with relations already formed. Basically, inclusion is always concerned with whether or not a relation exists. Within existent relations, control is the area concerned with who gives orders and makes decisions for whom, whereas openness is concerned with how emotionally close or distant the relation becomes. Thus, generally speaking, inclusion is concerned with the problem of in or out, control is concerned with top or bottom, and openness with close or far.

Further differentiation occurs with regard to the number of people involved in the relation. Openness is always a one-to-one relation, inclusion is usually a one-to-one relation and control may be either a one-one or a one-many relation. An open tie is necessarily between two persons, and involves varying degrees of intimacy, warmth, and emotional involvement which cannot be felt toward a unit greater than one person. Inclusion, on the other hand, typically concerns the behavior and feelings of one person toward a group of people. Problems of belonging and membership, so central to the inclusion area, usually refer to a relatively undifferentiated group with which an individual seeks association. His feelings of wanting to belong to the group are qualitatively different from his personal feeling of warmth toward an individual person. Control may refer to a power struggle between two individuals for control over each other, or it may refer to the struggle for domination over a group, as in political power. There is no particular number of interactional participants implied in the control area.

Control differs from the other two areas with respect to the differentiation between the persons involved in the control situation. For inclusion and affection there is a tendency for participants to act similarly in both the behavior they express and the behavior they want from others; for example, a close, personal individual usually likes others to be close and personal also. This similarity is not so marked in the control area. The person who likes to control may or may not want others to control him. This difference in differentiation among need areas is however, only a matter of degree. There are many who like to include but do not want to be included, or who are not personal but want others to be toward them; but these types are not as frequent as the corresponding types in the control area.



## B. INTERPRETATIONS OF SUMMARY SCORES

Interpretations of the summary scores (7,8,9 is high; 0,1,2 is low; 3,4,5,6 is medium, using absolute criteria) follow.

1. Inclusion. High score means a strong desire for contact with people regardless of who initiates it. Low score indicates preference for aloneness.
2. Control. Highscore means a desire for structure, a preference for giving and taking orders. Low scores mean low structure, a laissez-faire attitude with respect to authority, neither wanting to give nor to receive orders.
3. Openness. High score indicates desire for a great deal of exchange of affection and warmth. Low score means a preference for more personal distance from people and more impersonal, business-like relationships.
4. Expressed. High score means active initiation of behavior toward others. Low scores indicate little desire to initiate behavior toward people.
5. Wanted. High score means you want other people to initiate behavior toward you. Low score signifies a desire to have other people not initiate behavior toward you. point Total. High score means a preference for a great deal of interaction with people in all areas. Low score indicates a desire to have little contact with people, a desire to be more alone and uninvolved.
6. Inclusion. High score indicates a preference for initiating inclusion behavior rather than for receiving it. You want to do the inviting much more than be invited. Low score means the opposite: you would rather be the guest than the host. (The score says nothing about the amount of contact desired.)



7. Openness. High score means preference for initiating affection over receiving it. Low score means a larger desire for receiving affection than for giving it. (The score says nothing about the total amount of openness desired.)
8. Total. High score means a strong preference for waiting for other people to take the initiative toward you, whether it be contact, control or affection. .

Interpretation of FIRO scores may also be based on personality types. It is found that anxiety engendered by early experiences leads an individual to extreme behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and openness as indicated by the person's scores on the FIRO instrument. The extremes take the form of excess or lack. If the individual successfully worked through his interpersonal relations in one area, then he functions without anxiety in that area. For simplicity of presentation, the extremes are presented without qualification. Actually, behavior is always some combination incorporating elements of all three types at different times.

### 1. Inclusion Types

#### a. The Undersocial (low 'e', low 'w')

When I am an undersocial, a person with too little inclusion, I am introverted and withdrawn. I avoid associating with others and I do not accept invitations to join others. I maintain distance between myself and others. I do not get enmeshed with people and lose my privacy. Unconsciously I want other people to pay attention to me. My biggest fears are that people will ignore me, will have no interest in me, and would prefer to leave me behind.

Unconsciously I feel that no one will ever pay attention to me. Because no one is interested in me, I am not going to risk being ignored. I stay away from people and I get along by myself. I use self-sufficiency as a technique for existing without others. Since social abandonment is tantamount to death, I compensate by directing my energies toward self-preservation and I create a world of my own in which my existence is more secure. Behind my withdrawal I feel anxious and hostile, feelings I try to hide behind a facade of superiority and the private conviction that others do not understand me.

I withdraw from people. I express lack of involvement and commitment covertly by being late to meetings, by having an inordinate number of conflicting engagements necessitating absence from people, or by preceding each visit with, "I'm sorry, but I can't stay very long." If I do not associate with people, I lose my desire to live. To a large extent, my degree of commitment to living determines my general level of enthusiasm, perseverance, and involvement. Lack of concern for life is the ultimate in regression. Life holds too few rewards so that the prelife condition, namely, death, is preferable. Fear of abandonment or isolation is the most potent of all my interpersonal fears.

b. The Oversocial (high "e", high "w")

When I am an oversocial person, I seek people incessantly and I want them to seek me out. I am afraid they will ignore me. My basic feelings are just like those of the undersocial person, but my overt behavior is the opposite. Although I usually do not allow myself to be aware of it, my underlying feeling is that no one is interested in me. I respond to that feeling by making people pay attention to me in any way that I can. My inclination,

always, is to seek companionship. I cannot stand being alone. I design my activities to be done with someone else. Being together is an end in itself. I attempt to focus attention on myself, to make people notice me, to be prominent, to be listened to. One technique I use for doing this is to be an intensive, exhibitionistic participator. More subtly, I resort to name dropping, or to asking startling questions. I may also try to acquire power (control) or try to be well liked (affection), but for the primary purpose of gaining attention. Power or friendship, although both may be important, are not my primary goals.

c. The Social (moderate "e", moderate"w")

When I am a social, a person for whom the resolution of inclusion relations was successful in childhood, interaction with people presents no problem. I am comfortable with people and comfortable being alone. I can be a high, moderate, or low participator in a group without feeling anxious. I am capable of strong commitment to and involvement with certain groups and, if I feel it is appropriate, I can withhold commitment. I feel that I am a worthwhile, significant person and that life is worth living. I am capable of being genuinely interested in others and I feel that they will include me in their activities and that they are interested in me. I have an identity and individuality.

I never had the feeling of being a nobody. I have not had childhood feelings of confusion of identity that come from being enmeshed, that is, from being parts of other people without having a sufficient opportunity to discover who I am. I have integrated aspects of a large number of individuals into a new configuration which I identify as myself.

## 2. Control Types

### a. The Abdicrat (low "e", high "w")

When I am an abdicrat, I abdicate power and responsibility in interpersonal behavior. I gravitate toward the subordinate position where I will not have to take responsibility for making decisions and where someone else takes charge. I want you to relieve me of my obligations. I do not control you even when it is appropriate. For example, I would not take charge even during a fire in a children's schoolhouse in which I am the only adult. I never make a decision that I can refer to someone else. I fear that you will not help me when I need help and that I will be given more responsibility than I can handle. I am a follower, or, at most, a loyal lieutenant, but rarely the person who takes the responsibility for making the final decision. My real feeling about myself is that I am incapable of responsible, adult behavior, and I know that you know it. I never was told what I was supposed to do and I never learned. I avoid situations in which I feel helpless. I feel incompetent and irresponsible, perhaps stupid, and that I do not deserve respect for my abilities.

Behind this feeling is anxiety, hostility, and lack of trust toward you, who might withhold assistance. My hostility is usually expressed as passive resistance, since overt rebellion is too threatening.

### b. The Autocrat (high "e", low "w")

When I am an autocrat, I try to dominate you and strive to establish a power hierarchy with myself at the top. I am a power seeker. I am afraid that you will not only resist my influence but that you will, in fact, dominate me. I try to attain intellectual or athletic superiority or political power. My underlying dynamics are the same as



those of the abdicrat. I feel I am not capable of discharging obligation and that you know it. I use every opportunity to disprove this feeling to you and to myself. I will show you. I will make all the decision for everyone. Behind this feeling is a strong fear that you may make decisions for me and that you do not trust me.

c. The Democrat (moderate "e", moderate "w")

When I am a democrat, a person who, in childhood, had successfully resolved my relations with others in the control area, I have no problem with taking or not taking orders as appropriate to the situation. I feel that I am a capable, responsible person. I do not need to shrink from responsibility nor try constantly to prove how competent I am. Unlike the abdicrat and autocrat, I am not preoccupied with fears of my own helplessness, stupidity, and incompetence. I feel that other people respect my competence and trust me with decision-making.

3. Openness Types

a. The Underpersonal (l "e", low "w")

When I am an underpersonal, I avoid close, personal ties with you. I maintain our relation on a superficial, distant level and I am most comfortable when you do the same to me. I wish to maintain this emotional distance. I do not want to get "emotionally involved." At a deeper level I want a satisfactory affectional relation. I fear that you do not love me, no one does. In a group situation I am afraid that I will not be liked. I have great difficulty liking you. I do not trust your feelings toward me. I find the openness area very painful since I have been rejected, therefore I shall avoid close, personal relations in the future. I do this by reflecting or avoiding you.



Sometimes I use the technique of being superficially friendly to everyone. This is a safeguard against having to get emotionally close to any one person. I am not comfortable confiding my private concerns and feelings or expressing my feelings of affection and tenderness. The dyadic relation is a threatening one. By keeping everyone at the same distance, I avoid the necessity of treating you with greater warmth and openness.

My deepest anxiety is that I am unlovable. I feel that you will not like me because, in fact, I do not "deserve" it. If you were to know me well, you would discover the traits that make me so unlovable. In contrast to the inclusion anxiety that I am worthless and empty, and the control anxiety that I am stupid and irresponsible, the affection anxiety is that I am nasty and bad.

b. The Overpersonal (high "e", high "w")

When I am overpersonal, I try to become extremely close to you. I want you to treat me in a close, personal way. Although my first experiences with openness were painful, if I try again, they may turn out to be better. My primary desire in interpersonal relations is to be liked. Being liked is extremely important to me in order to relieve my anxiety about being reflected and unlovable. I sometimes make overt attempts to gain approval by being extremely personal, intimate and confiding. At other times, I tend to be possessive, to devour friends, and to punish any attempts by them to establish other friendships.

Both my overpersonal and my underpersonal responses are extreme, both are motivated by a strong need for affection, both are accompanied by strong anxiety about ever being loved and about being unlovable, and both have considerable hostility behind them stemming from my anticipation of rejection.

c. The Personal (moderate "e", moderate "w")

When I am being personal, someone who successfully resolved openness relations with other people during childhood, I have no problem with close, emotional relations with you. I am comfortable in such a personal relation, and I can also relate comfortably in a situation requiring emotional distance. It is important for me to be liked, and if I am not liked I can accept that the dislike is the result of the relation between myself and you. In other words, being disliked by you does not mean that I am an unlovable person. I feel that I am a lovable person especially to people who know me well. I am capable of giving genuine openness.

C. SUMMARY

This "reader: on the FIRO theory of interpersonal relations is intended to aid you in developing your awareness of yourself and of your relations to other people. This is not designed to evaluate; it simply helps you to know more about the way you see your self.

Truth is what is. Your truth is what is true about you. You allow yourself to know your truth by becoming aware. Once you become aware you can deal more effectively with your life.

Honesty is the key to successful interpersonal relations. You are honest to the degree to which you share your awareness with someone else.

The choice is yours. You are free to choose the degree to which you become involved with yourself and with others; to become "conscious" and "aware" or to remain "unconscious" and "unaware." And to that end, I hope that this proves invaluable in helping you make your choice.

APPENDIX E  
PERSONAL & GROUP DATA SHEET

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS DATA SHEET BY FILLING IN THE INFORMATION THAT IS REQUESTED. ALL OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED WILL BE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. THE DATA WILL BE USED FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

Command Name \_\_\_\_\_

Department Name \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Group \_\_\_\_\_

Your Paygrade (e.g. E1, O4) \_\_\_\_\_

Number of years (to the nearest whole number)  
that you have been in your current paygrade \_\_\_\_\_

Sex                      \_\_\_\_\_M                      \_\_\_\_\_F

Your Age (in whole years) \_\_\_\_\_

Highest degree or diploma received \_\_\_\_\_

Number of years (to the nearest whole number)  
that you have been on active duty in the Navy \_\_\_\_\_

Number of months you've been at your command \_\_\_\_\_

Number of months you've been working in  
your department \_\_\_\_\_

Number of months that you've been a member  
of this group \_\_\_\_\_

CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR ANSWER TO THE  
TWO QUESTIONS BELOW:

How effective do you believe this group is in doing its work?

not  
effective

1

moderately  
effective

3

highly  
effective

5

How influential do you feel you are in this group?

not  
influential

1

moderately  
influential

3

highly  
influential

5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION



APPENDIX F  
TABLES

TABLE 1  
Overview of Age of Subjects

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Average Age in Years</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 23                        | 20-29                       |
| 59                        | 30-39                       |
| 30                        | 40-49                       |
| 5                         | 50-62                       |

TABLE 2  
Education Level

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Education level</u>  |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 40                        | high school equivalent  |
| 35                        | high school             |
| 13                        | associates              |
| 22                        | bachelors               |
| 5                         | masters or post college |
| 1                         | doctorate               |

TABLE 3  
Years Active Duty

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Years active duty</u> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 11                        | 1-5                      |
| 22                        | 6-10                     |
| 29                        | 16-20                    |
| 19                        | 21-25                    |
| 5                         | 26-30                    |
| 1                         | 31-35                    |
| 1                         | 36-40                    |

TABLE 4  
Years in Grade

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Years in paygrade</u> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 18                        | 1                        |
| 22                        | 2                        |
| 20                        | 4                        |
| 16                        | 5                        |
| 3                         | 6                        |
| 4                         | 7                        |
| 1                         | 8                        |
| 2                         | 10                       |
| 2                         | 12                       |

TABLE 5  
Title or Rank

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Title</u>            |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1                         | O1, O2, CW01, CW02      |
| 35                        | O3, O4, CW03, CW04      |
| 20                        | O5, O6                  |
| 2                         | E1, E2, E3, E4          |
| 24                        | E5, E6                  |
| 19                        | E7, E8, E9              |
| 1                         | GS1, GS2, GS3, GS4      |
| 8                         | GS5, GS6, GS7, GS8, GS9 |
| 2                         | GS10, GS11, GS12        |

TABLE 6  
Total Years at Command

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Years at command</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 38                        | < 1                     |
| 42                        | 1-2                     |
| 22                        | 2-3                     |
| 6                         | 3-4                     |
| 4                         | 4-5                     |
| 1                         | 5                       |
| 1                         | 6                       |
| 2                         | 10                      |
| 1                         | 11                      |

TABLE 7  
Average Time as Groupmember

| <u>Number of subjects</u> | <u>Time in Group</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 49                        | < 1                  |
| 38                        | 1-2                  |
| 20                        | 2-3                  |
| 6                         | 3-4                  |
| 3                         | 4-5                  |
| 1                         | 7                    |
| 1                         | 10                   |

TABLE 8  
Hours Group Met

| <u>Number subjects</u> | <u>Hours in group</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 35                     | 2-20                  |
| 25                     | 20-40                 |
| 13                     | 40-60                 |
| 12                     | 60-80                 |
| 12                     | 80-100                |
| 6                      | 100-120               |
| 8                      | 120-140               |
| 2                      | 140-160               |
| 4                      | 160-208               |

TABLE 9  
Self and Other Agency/Communion Score Comparisons

| <u>Agency Totals</u> ( <u>others</u> )    |                    |  |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Agency Totals<br>(self)                   | R=.2928<br>p=0.002 |  |
| <u>Communion Totals</u> ( <u>others</u> ) |                    |  |
| Communion Totals<br>(self)                | R=.0141<br>p=0.448 |  |

TABLE 10  
Correlations between Control and AT,CT Scores

|                   | <u>Econtrol</u> | <u>Wcontrol</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Agency<br>(self)  | .2063 (p=.014)  | -.0809 (p=.196) |
| Commun<br>(self)  | -.0393 (p=.34)  | .0415 (p=.332)  |
| Agency<br>(other) | .2690 (p=.005)  | .0411 (p=.348)  |
| Commun<br>(other) | -.0001 (p=.496) | .2738 (p=.005)  |

TABLE 11

## Multiple Regressions (Own Scores Predicting Others Scores)

| <u>Independent</u>                        | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Group Decisions              |                  |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise Entry)                          |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Influence of decisions<br>(self assessed) |                  | .400        | p=.0102     | .359     | .338     |
| (Forced Entry)                            |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communal behavior                         |                  | -.081       | p=.4790     | -.040    | .030     |
| Agentic behavior                          |                  | .032        | p=.8090     | .011     | .197     |
| Influence on process<br>(self assessed)   |                  | -.073       | p=.6491     | -.059    | .152     |
| Influ on effectiveness                    |                  | -10E-03     | p=.9583     | 7E-03    | .171     |

TABLE 12

## Multiple Regressions (Own Predicting Others Scores)

| <u>Independent</u>                        | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Process                      |                  |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise Entry)                          |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Influence on decisions<br>(self assessed) |                  | .410        | p=.0018     | .417     | .260     |
| (Forced Entry)                            |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communal behavior                         |                  | -.081       | p=.4842     | -.043    | -.035    |
| Agentic behavior                          |                  | -.165       | p=.2235     | -.063    | .037     |
| Influence on process<br>(self assessed)   |                  | .015        | p=.9256     | .013     | .098     |
| Influ on effectiveness<br>(self assessed) |                  | -.050       | p=.7757     | -.041    | .076     |



TABLE 13

## Multiple Regressions (Own Scores Predicting Others)

| <u>Independent</u>                        | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Effectiveness                |                  |             |             |          |          |
| (Forced Entry)                            |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communal behavior                         |                  | -.145       | p=.2095     | -.082    | -.031    |
| Agentic behavior                          |                  | -.025       | p=.6930     | -.025    | .108     |
| Influence on process<br>(self assessed)   |                  | .064        | p=.6950     | .060     | .146     |
| Influ on effectiveness<br>(self assessed) |                  | -.022       | p=.8993     | -.019    | .128     |

TABLE 14

## Multiple Regressions (Own Scores Predicting Others)

| <u>Independent</u>   | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Other's Satisfaction |                  |             |             |          |          |
| (Forced Entry)       |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Knowledge            |                  | .90E-04     | p=.9930     | 5E-04    | -.029    |
| Self Satisfaction    |                  | -.042       | p=.7111     | -.048    | -.059    |
| Communal behavior    |                  | .032        | p=.7810     | .010     | -.024    |
| Agentic behavior     |                  | -.071       | p=.5448     | -.016    | -.074    |

TABLE 15  
Communion Totals between Raters

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>      |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>p=****  | 0.4127<br>p=0.000 | 0.3614<br>p=0.000 | 0.2646<br>p=0.004  |
| Rater2 | 0.4127<br>p=0.000 | 1.0000<br>p=****  | 0.3517<br>p=0.000 | 0.3505<br>p=0.000  |
| Rater3 | 0.3614<br>p=0.000 | 0.3517<br>p=0.000 | 1.0000<br>p=****  | 0.2673<br>p=0.0004 |
| Rater4 | 0.2646<br>p=0.004 | 0.3505<br>p=0.000 | 0.2673<br>p=0.004 | 1.0000<br>p=****   |

TABLE 16  
Agency Totals between Raters

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>      |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>p=****  | 0.5896<br>p=0.000 | 0.5282<br>p=0.000 | 0.4632<br>p=0.000  |
| Rater2 | 0.5895<br>p=0.000 | 1.0000<br>p=****  | 0.5316<br>p=0.000 | 0.5174<br>p=0.000  |
| Rater3 | 0.5282<br>p=0.000 | 0.5316<br>p=0.000 | 1.0000<br>p=****  | 0.4500<br>p=0.0000 |
| Rater4 | 0.4632<br>p=0.004 | 0.5174<br>p=0.000 | 0.4500<br>p=0.000 | 1.0000<br>p=****   |

TABLE 17  
Inter-rater Comparisons of Knowledge Variable

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>     |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.4408<br>P=0.000 | 0.3730<br>P=0.000 | 0.3747<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater2 | 0.4408<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.4077<br>P=0.000 | 0.4507<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater3 | 0.3730<br>P=0.000 | 0.4077<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.4208<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater4 | 0.3747<br>P=0.000 | 0.4507<br>P=0.000 | 0.4208<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=***** |

TABLE 18  
Inter-rater Comparisons on Satisfaction Variable

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>     |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.3621<br>P=0.000 | 0.2482<br>P=0.006 | 0.2836<br>P=0.002 |
| Rater2 | 0.3621<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.3071<br>P=0.001 | 0.3696<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater3 | 0.2482<br>P=0.006 | 0.3071<br>P=0.001 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.2530<br>P=0.005 |
| Rater4 | 0.2836<br>P=0.002 | 0.3696<br>P=0.000 | 0.2530<br>P=0.005 | 1.0000<br>P=***** |

TABLE 19  
Inter-rater Comparisons on Infl of Decisions

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>     |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.4725<br>P=0.000 | 0.2832<br>P=0.002 | 0.4291<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater2 | 0.4725<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.2847<br>P=0.002 | 0.5375<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater3 | 0.2832<br>P=0.002 | 0.2847<br>P=0.002 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.2913<br>P=0.002 |
| Rater4 | 0.4291<br>P=0.000 | 0.5375<br>P=0.000 | 0.2913<br>P=0.002 | 1.0000<br>P=***** |

TABLE 20  
Inter-rater Comparisons of Infl on Process

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>     |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.6338<br>P=0.000 | 0.4299<br>P=0.000 | 0.5057<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater2 | 0.6338<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.4824<br>P=0.000 | 0.6299<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater3 | 0.4299<br>P=0.000 | 0.4824<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=***** | 0.4418<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater4 | 0.5057<br>P=0.000 | 0.6299<br>P=0.000 | 0.4418<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=***** |

TABLE 21  
Inter-rater Comparisons on Infl on Effectiveness

|        | <u>Rater1</u>     | <u>Rater2</u>     | <u>Rater3</u>     | <u>Rater4</u>     |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Rater1 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.3752<br>P=0.000 | 0.3010<br>P=0.001 | 0.3440<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater2 | 0.3752<br>P=0.000 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.3066<br>P=0.001 | 0.4840<br>P=0.000 |
| Rater3 | 0.3010<br>P=0.001 | 0.3066<br>P=0.001 | 1.0000<br>P=****  | 0.3110<br>P=0.001 |
| Rater4 | 0.3440<br>P=0.000 | 0.4840<br>P=0.000 | 0.3110<br>P=0.001 | 1.0000<br>P=****  |

TABLE 22  
Relation between Agency and Effectiveness Variables

|                        | <u>Agency</u> |             |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|                        | <u>R</u>      | <u>sign</u> |
| Influ on effectiveness | .86           | .000        |
| Influ on decisions     | .91           | .000        |
| Influ on process       | .80           | .000        |
| Satisfaction           | .67           | .000        |



TABLE 23

Relation between Communion and Effectiveness Variables

|                        | <u>Communion</u> |      |
|------------------------|------------------|------|
|                        | R                | sign |
| Influ on effectiveness | .81              | .000 |
| Influ on decisions     | .68              | .000 |
| Influ on process       | .87              | .000 |
| Satisfaction           | .91              | .000 |

TABLE 24

Agency/Communion Correlated with Dependent Variables

|                        | <u>Agency + Communion</u> |             |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
|                        | <u>R</u>                  | <u>sign</u> |
| Influ on effectiveness | R= .93                    | p= .000     |
| Influ on decisions     | R= .83                    | p= .000     |
| Influ on process       | R= .92                    | p= .000     |
| Satisfaction           | R= .88                    | p= .000     |

TABLE 25  
Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others)

| <u>Independent</u>                                 | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|--|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Group's Decisions<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communal behavior                                  |                  | .152        | p=.0040     | .057     | .67      |
| Agentic behavior                                   |                  | .798        | p=.0000     | .057     | .90      |

TABLE 26  
Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others)

| <u>Independent</u>  | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Individual's Influence on Group Process<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communal behavior   |                  | .571        | p=.0000     | .233     | .85      |
| Agentic behavior  |                  | .427        | p=.0000     | .151     | .80      |

TABLE 27  
Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others)

| <u>Independent</u>  | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Individual's Influence on Group Effectiveness<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Agentic behavior  |                  | .578        | p=.0000     | .214     | .85      |
| Communal behavior   |                  | .427        | p=.0000     | .183     | .65      |

TABLE 28  
Multiple Regressions (As Rated by Others)

| <u>Independent</u>  | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Other's Satisfaction with Individual's Behavior<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communal behavior   |                  | .766        | p=.0000     | .185     | .88      |
| Agentic behavior  |                  | .172        | p=.0025     | .036     | .67      |

TABLE 29  
Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency & Communion)

| <u>Independent</u>  | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Individual Influence on Group Decisions<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Agency + Commun   |                  | .873        | p=.0000     | .167     | .87      |

TABLE 30  
Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency & Communion)

| <u>Independent</u>                             | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|--|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Group Process<br>(Stepwise entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Agency + commun                                |                  | .900        | p=.0000     | .188     | .90      |

TABLE 31

## Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency &amp; Communion)

| <u>Independent</u>  | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Individual's Influence on Group Effectiveness<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Agency + Ccmmun   |                  | .913        | p=.0000     | .201     | .91      |

TABLE 32

## Multiple Regressions (Combining Agency &amp; Communion)

| <u>Independent</u>               | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Satisfaction<br>(Stepwise Entry) |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Agency + Commun                  |                  | .851        | p=.0000     | .106     | .85      |

TABLE 33

## Relationships between Control and Agency, Communion

|        | <u>Express</u><br><u>control</u> | <u>Want</u><br><u>control</u> |
|--------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Agency | .2690 (p=.005)                   | .0411 (p=.348)                |
| Ccmmun | -.0001 (p=.496)                  | .2738 (p=.005)                |

TABLE 34

## Relation between Agency and Express Control

| <u>Independent</u> | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
|                    | Agency           |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise Entry)   |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Express<br>Control |                  | .2203       | .0156       | .694     | .22      |

TABLE 35

## Relation between Want Control and Communion

| <u>Independent</u> | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
|                    | Communion        |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise entry)   |                  |             |             |          |          |
| want control       |                  | .218        | .0169       | .719     | .22      |

TABLE 36

## Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge

| <u>Independent</u>    | <u>Dependent</u>                   | <u>Beta</u>  | <u>sign</u>    | <u>B</u>     | <u>R</u>   |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
|                       | Influence on Group's Effectiveness |              |                |              |            |
| (Stepwise entry)      |                                    |              |                |              |            |
| agency                |                                    | .394         | .0000          | .146         | .85        |
| communic<br>knowledge |                                    | .406<br>.249 | .0000<br>.0000 | .174<br>.299 | .80<br>.79 |



TABLE 37  
Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge

| <u>Independent</u>     | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Decisions |                  |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise entry)       |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Agency                 |                  | .542        | .0000       | .175     | .90      |
| Knowledge              |                  | .347        | .0000       | .364     | .85      |
| Communicn              |                  | .123        | .0077       | .046     | .67      |

TABLE 38  
Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge

| <u>Independent</u>         | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|----------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Influence on Group Process |                  |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise entry)           |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communion                  |                  | .556        | .0000       | .227     | .85      |
| Agency                     |                  | .292        | .0000       | .104     | .80      |
| Knowledge                  |                  | .182        | .0040       | .209     | .73      |

TABLE 39  
Multiple Regressions Adding Knowledge

| <u>Independent</u> | <u>Dependent</u> | <u>Beta</u> | <u>sign</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>R</u> |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|
|                    | Satisfaction     |             |             |          |          |
| (Stepwise entry)   |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communications     |                  | .766        | .0000       | .185     | .88      |
| Agency             |                  | .172        | .0025       | .036     | .67      |
| (Forced Entry)     |                  |             |             |          |          |
| Communications     |                  | .770        | .0000       | .186     | .88      |
| Agency             |                  | .204        | .043        | .0086    | .67      |
| Knowledge          |                  | -.043       | -.029       | .5421    | .55      |

TABLE 40  
Means on Effectiveness/Control Variables by Category

|                            | <u>HighA/<br/>LowC</u> | <u>LowA/<br/>HighC</u> | <u>HighA/<br/>HighC</u> | <u>LowA/<br/>LowC</u> |
|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| effectiveness<br>influence | 23.46                  | 22.77                  | 25.54                   | 18.36                 |
| decision<br>influence      | 17.46                  | 15.32                  | 18.47                   | 12.42                 |
| process<br>influence       | 21.59                  | 22.09                  | 24.04                   | 17.21                 |
| satisfaction               | 10.44                  | 11.35                  | 12.54                   | 8.80                  |
| express<br>control         | 6.54                   | 4.13                   | 5.78                    | 4.90                  |
| want<br>control            | 3.92                   | 5.40                   | 5.17                    | 4.05                  |
| Differences<br>in control  | 2.62                   | -1.27                  | .67                     | .90                   |
|                            | (p=.008)               | (p=.130)               | (p=.246)                | (p=.263)              |

TABLE 41

Difference in Express Control within Sample

| <u>Group</u> | <u># Cases</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>Std dev</u> | <u>t test</u> |
|--------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| high/high    | 41             | 5.76        | 2.65           |               |
|              |                |             |                | .34           |
| low/low      | 21             | 4.90        | 2.43           |               |

TABLE 42

Differences on Want Control within Sample

| <u>Group</u> | <u># Cases</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>Std dev</u> | <u>t test</u> |
|--------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| high/high    | 41             | 5.02        | 2.19           |               |
|              |                |             |                | .25           |
| low/low      | 21             | 4.05        | 2.48           |               |

TABLE 43

Differences on Control Scores between High/Low Sample

| <u>Group</u>    | <u>Mean</u> | <u>Difference</u> | <u>t test</u> |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|
| high/low        | 6.54        |                   |               |
| Express control |             | 2.41              | p=.0107       |
| low/high        | 4.13        |                   |               |
| high/low        | 3.92        |                   |               |
| want control    |             | -1.49             | p=.0908       |
| low/high        | 5.40        |                   |               |

APPENDIX G  
MULTIPLE REGRESSION FIGURES

(Based on Averaged Ratings From 4 Others)

| <u>Dependent Variables</u>     | <u>Independent Variables</u> |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Influ on Decisions             | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Influ on Process               | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Influ on Group's Effectiveness | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Satisfaction                   | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Agency                         | Express Control              |
| Communion                      | Want Control                 |

Figure G.1    Multiple Regressions    .

(Based on Self Ratings)

| <u>Dependent Variables</u>        | <u>Independent Variables</u>          |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Influ on Decisions                | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self) |
| Influ on Process                  | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self) |
| Influ on Group's<br>Effectiveness | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self) |
| Satisfaction                      | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self) |

Figure G.2 Multiple Regressions

| Dependent<br>(others)             | (Comparing Self and Other Ratings)<br>Independent<br>(self) |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Influ on Decisions                | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self)                       |
| Influ on Process                  | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self)                       |
| Influ on Group's<br>Effectiveness | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self)                       |
| Satisfaction                      | Agency, Communion,<br>Knowledge(self)                       |

Figure G.3 Multiple Regressions



(Comparing Self and Other Ratings)

| Dependent<br>(self)               | Independent<br>(others)      |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Influ on Decisions                | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Influ on Process                  | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Influ on Group's<br>Effectiveness | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Self Satisfaction                 | Agency, Communion, Knowledge |
| Agency (self)                     | Agency, Communion            |
| Communion (self)                  | Communion, Agency            |

Figure G.4 Multiple Regressions

(Integration of Agency and Communion)  
(Using ratings of four others)

| Dependent                     | Independent        |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Influence on decisions        | Agency + Communion |
| Influence on process          | Agency + Communion |
| Influence on<br>effectiveness | Agency + Communion |
| Satisfaction                  | Agency + Communion |

Figure G.5 Multiple Regressions

## LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Pascale, R. T. and Athos, A. G., The Art of Japanese Management, Simon and Schuster, 1987.
2. Korman, A. K., "Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria-A Review," Personnel Psychology, v. 18, pp. 349-360, 1966.
3. Sales, S. M., "Supervisory Style and Productivity: Review and Theory," Personnel Psychology, v. 19, pp. 275-285, 1966.
4. Fleishman, E. A. and Hunt, J. G., (eds.), Current Developments in the Study of Leadership, Southern Illinois Press, 1973.
5. Stogdill, R., Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research, The Free Press, 1974.
6. Yukl, G., "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Leadership," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, v. 6, pp. 414-440, August 1971.
7. Keys, J. B., and Miller, T. R., "Management Theory Jungle," Academy of Management Review, v. 9, pp. 342-353, February 1984.
8. Bakan, D., The Duality of Human Existence, Rand McNally, 1966.
9. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
10. Ibid., p. 39.
11. Hamilton, E., Influence Style Questionnaire, unpublished instrument developed at Harvard University, 1981.
12. Harrison, E. F., "Military Organizations," To Get The Job Done, 2nd ed., pp. 1-27, Naval Institute Press, 1981.
13. Benton, J. C., "Promoting Leadership in the Air Force's Management Environment," Air University Review, v. 33, pp. 84-92, March/April 1982.

14. Staley, H. A., "Feedback...A Unique Key to Leadership," Air University Review, v. 33, p. 61, May/June 1982.
15. Ouchi, W. C., Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge, Addison-Wesley, 1981.
16. Atwater, L. Y., Quality Circles in the Navy, Productivity Improvement or Just Another Program? Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, pp. 4-13, July 1981.
17. Hamilton, E., An Empirical Field Study of Effective Influence Behavior in Decision-making Groups, Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1982.
18. Hazama, H., "Japanese-Style Management," Japanese Economic Studies, v. 6, pp. 110-173, Spring/Summer 1978.
19. Turner, F. J., The Frontier in American History, pp. 1- 375, H. Holt and Company, 1920.
20. Pascale, R. T. and Athos, A. G., The Art of Japanese Management, p. 60, Simon and Schuster, 1981.
21. Ibid., pp. 64-68.
22. Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H., Jr., In Search of Excellence, pp. 1-50, Warner Books, 1982.
23. Japan, pp. 120-143, Touche Ross International, 1980.
24. Hague, J. A., (ed.), American Character and Culture: Some Twentieth Century Perspectives, pp. 7-140, Deland, 1964.
25. Clavell, J., Shogun, Dell Publishing Company, 1975.
26. Abegglen, J., The Japanese Factor, Free Press 1958.
27. Yoshino, M., Japan's Managerial System: Tradition and Innovation, pp. 234-275, MIT Press, 1968.
28. Johnson, R. T. and Ouchi W. G., "Made in America (Under Japanese Management)," Harvard Business Review, v. 52, .pp 61-69, September/October 1974.

29. Pascale, R. T. and Maguire, M., "Comparison of Selected Work Factors in Japan and the United States," Human Relations, v. 33, pp. 433-455, July 1980.
30. Howard, N. and Teramoto, Y., "The Really Important Difference between Japanese and Western Management," Management International Review, v. 21, pp. 19-30, March 1981.
31. Pascale, R. T. and Athos, A. G., The Art of Japanese Management, pp. 60-68, Simon and Schuster, 1981.
32. Ibid., p. 84.
33. Ibid., pp. 150-208.
34. Bradford, D. W. and Cohen, A. R., Managing for Excellence, pp. 62-93, John-Wiley and Sons, 1983.
35. Peters, T. J. and Waterman R. H., Jr., In Search of Excellence, Warner Books, 1982.
36. McMurry, R. N., "Power and the Ambitious Executive," Executive Success, Making It in Management, pp. 24-33, John Wiley and Sons, 1983.
37. Korda, M., Power! How to Get It, How to Use It, Random House, 1975.
38. McClelland, D. C., "The Two Faces of Power," To Get the Job Done, 2nd ed., pp. 260-269, Naval Institute Press, 1981.
39. Cumming, P., The Power Handbook, pp. 1-15, CBI Publishing Company, 1981.
40. Zander, A. F., Making Groups Effective, pp. 1-150, Jossey-Bass, 1982.
41. Schutz, W., "On Group Composition," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 62, pp. 275-281, March 1961.
42. Mos, R. H., and Speisman, J. C., "Group Compatability and Productivity," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, v. 65, pp. 190-196, June 1962.

43. Sapolsky, A., "Relationship Between Patient-Doctor Compatability, Mutual Perception, and Outcome of Treatment," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, v. 70, pp. 70-76, February 1965.
44. Frost, T., Stimpson, D. V., and Maughman, M. R., "Some Correlates of Trust," Journal of Psychology, v. 99, pp. 103-108, May 1978.
45. Developing A Model of Influence Behavior: A Research Report, The Forum Corporation of North America, Research and Development Group, 1983.
46. Schutz, W. C., "The Interpersonal Underworld," Harvard Business Review, v. 36, pp. 123-136, July/August 1958.
47. Argyris, C., Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness, Irwin-Rorsey, 1962.
48. Kramer, E., "A Contribution Toward the Firo-B Questionnaire," Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, v. 31, pp. 80-81, 1967.
49. Jago, A. G. and Vroom, V. H., "Perceptions of Leadership Style: Superior and Subordinate Descriptions of Decision-Making Behavior," School of Organization and Management, Yale University, December 1974.
50. Mitchell, T. R., "The Construct Validity of Three Dimensions of Leadership Research," Journal of Social Psychology, v. 80, pp. 89-94, 1970.
51. Oshry, B., "Notes on the Power and Systems Perspective," Power and Systems Training, Inc., 1976.
52. Bradford, D. W., and Cohen, A. R., Managing for Excellence, pp. 1-93, 1984.



# INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

|   | No. Copies |
|---|------------|
| 1. Defense Technical Information Center<br>Cameron Station<br>Alexandria, Virginia 22314  | 2          |
| 2. Library, Code 0142<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93943  | 2          |
| 3. Dr. William Greer, Code 54<br>Department of Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Post Graduate School<br>Monterey, California 93943  | 1          |
| 4. Professor E. Hamilton, Code 54HM<br>Department of Administrative Science<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93943                                      | 2          |
| 5. Professor R. Harris, Code 54H<br>Department of Administrative Sciences<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, California 93943  | 1          |
| 6. Lieutenant C. McMahon<br>189 W Glendale Drive<br>Lemcore, California 93245   | 1          |
| 7. Director, Leadership & Command Effectiveness<br>Division (NMPC-62)<br>Human Resource Management Department<br>Naval Military Personnel Command<br>Washington, D.C. 20370 | 1          |
| 8. Director, Human Resources Management Division<br>(OP-15)<br>Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower,<br>Personnel & Training)<br>Washington, D.C. 20370               | 1          |
| 9. Commanding Officer<br>Human Resource Management School<br>Naval Air Station Memphis<br>Millington, Tennessee 38054   | 1          |
| 10. Commanding Officer<br>Organizational Effectiveness Center<br>NAS Alameda<br>Alameda, California 94501   | 1          |
| 11. ICDR Brenda M. Gagner<br>8673 Hickory Ridge Court<br>Springfield, Virginia 22153  | 1          |
| 12. Commanding Officer<br>Organizational Effectiveness Center Norfolk<br>5621-23 Tidewater Drive<br>Norfolk, Virginia 23509   | 1          |

13. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Pearl Harbor  
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860 1
14. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center San Diego  
Naval Training Center, Building 304  
San Diego, California 93941 1
15. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center & School  
Fort Ord, California 93941 1
16. Commander  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Washington  
Commonwealth Building, Room 1144  
1300 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, Virginia 22209 1
17. Commander  
Organizational Effectiveness System Atlantic  
5621-21 Tidewater Drive  
Norfolk, Virginia 23509 1
18. Commander  
Organizational Effectiveness System Pacific  
P. C. Box 72  
Naval Station  
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860 1
19. Commanding Officer  
Organizational System Europe  
P. C. Box 23  
FPO New York 09510 1
20. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Charleston  
Naval Base, Building NH-46  
Charleston, South Carolina 29408 1
21. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Mayport  
Naval Station  
Mayport, Florida 32228 1
22. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Naples  
P. C. Box 3  
FPO New York 09521 1
23. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Rota  
U. S. Naval Station Rota (Spain) Box 41  
FPO New York 09540 1
24. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Subic Bay  
P. C. Box 60  
FPO San Francisco 96651 1
25. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Whidbey Island  
Naval Air Station Whidbey Island  
Cak Harbor, Washington 98278 1
26. Commanding Officer  
Organizational Effectiveness Center Yokosuka  
P. C. Box 4  
FPO Seattle 98762 1

27. Officer In Charge  
Naval Security Group Detachment  
Presidio of Monterey  
Monterey, California 93943

1

13537 5

*B*







210382

Thesis Thesis

M2519 M2519 McMahon

c.1 c.1

Are Navy members with  
integrated behavioral  
styles considered to be  
more effective?

19 MAY 86  
8 JUN 88

13861  
32678

210382

Thesis

M2519 McMahon

c.1

Are Navy members with  
integrated behavioral  
styles considered to be  
more effective?



